

LEFT AND RIGHT

DROPPING THE BOMB

ANTI-IMPERIALISM

THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

MORAL EDUCATION

A JOURNAL OF LIBERTARIAN THOUGHT

SPRING 1966

VOL. II NO. 2

85c

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEFT AND RIGHT

A Journal Of Libertarian Thought

Editors: MURRAY N. ROTHBARD

LEONARD P. LIGGIO

H. GEORGE RESCH

CONTENTS	Spring 1966	Vol. II, No. 2
----------	-------------	----------------

EDITORIALS

The Irish Revolution	3
The Power of the President	8
Labor Unionism, Two Views	12
Cold War Revisionism, The Major Historical Task	17
Our First Anniversary	31

WILLIAM L. NEUMANN, Hiroshima Reconsidered	33
---	----

LEONARD P. LIGGIO, Early Anti-Imperialism	39
--	----

RUSSELL D. STETLER, JR., The Freedom to Travel	58
---	----

REPRINT:

HERBERT SPENCER, On Moral Education	73
--	----

Left and Right is published three times yearly (Winter, Spring, Autumn) by Left and Right, Inc., Box 395, Cathedral Station, New York, New York 10025. Subscription price: \$2.50. Single issues: 85c.

NEW

INDIVIDUALIST

REVIEW

**Interested in the
Anti-Conservative Right?**

**Interested in
Libertarian Ideas?**

NEW INDIVIDUALIST REVIEW was founded in 1961 with the intent of voicing a consistent and informed libertarian position—civil liberties, limited government, and freedom of contract and property—without contaminating the cause of liberty with anti-Communism and the American Empire.

IF YOU ARE INTERESTED in the ideas and evidence supporting a voluntary society; if you have discovered the intellectual bankruptcy of the authoritarian, statist position (Leftist and Rightist) then you should subscribe to **NEW INDIVIDUALIST REVIEW**, a journal of Classical Liberal thought, published quarterly. Subscription rates are \$3.00 per year; students, \$1.50.

WRITE: NEW INDIVIDUALIST REVIEW
Ida Noyes Hall
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637

EDITORIAL

The Irish Revolution

Fifty years ago, on Easter Monday, April 25, 1916, began the glorious Irish Revolution, a revolution that was to end by sweeping away a monstrous record of brutality and oppression that had been foisted for centuries upon the long-suffering Irish people. In defeating the mighty armies of the greatest and most ruthless empire on the face of the earth, the Irish were the first people to have the courage and the stamina to follow through on the promise of the American Revolution against the same imperial oppressors: a Revolution that had been the first successful war of national liberation in modern history. The Irish Revolution was the second such successful war. For other wars of national liberation prompted by the American Revolution (e. g. Belgium, the Netherlands, Geneva, and later the revolutions of 1848) had been beaten back by the forces of armed international counter-revolution.

The Irish Revolution was fought and won in the only way such wars can be won: in relentless guerrilla fashion, by an armed people. Characteristically, it was begun heedlessly, recklessly by a relatively small band of idealistic young people, young people who did not sit around waiting for the ripening of "objective conditions" before launching their rebellion. The Easter Rising was hopeless, bungled, quixotic, doomed--and yet was eventually to succeed, thus confirming the unquenchable convictions of the rebel leaders. As the historian of the Irish Revolution writes:

The leaders realized with complete clarity that the majority of the Irish people were almost lost to all sense of the rights of Ireland as a nation, had learned to rely on the vague optimism of the Parliamentarians and were ready to give thanks for a petty instalment of Home Rule. The Independence movement was the movement of a minority still, and those who were ready to give and take

life in armed insurrection were a minority in that movement. They believed, however, that the inherent native passion for freedom was dormant, not extinguished, and that only bold action was needed to arouse the people to a sense of their rights, their needs, and the strength that still lay within them unused.¹

While their actions were quixotic in the short-run, the rebel leaders were astute enough to realize that England's troubles were Ireland's opportunity, and that therefore England's embroilment in World War I furnished an indispensable opportunity for launching the revolution. This illustrates the general historical rule that imperialist wars form the seedbed of revolution.

The linkage between America and the Irish cause has not been confined to the influence of the American Revolution. The Irish cause has long been sustained and nurtured, materially and morally, by Irish-Americans, in such influential organizations as the Clan-na-Gael. Irish-and-American linkage has also run the other way: for the methods and procedures used by the English to suppress the Irish then served as models for English imperial rule over the American colonies. Not only that; for the genocidal racism directed against the Irish also served as model for the English-American treatment of the American Indian. The pattern of dehumanization was for the English to steal Irish land, murder and drive out the inhabitants, and then to sneer at the unfortunate Irish as inhuman because they somehow chose to live in squalor and misery. Thus, the English historian William Thomas wrote in 1552:

. . .the wild Irish, as unreasonable beasts, lived without any knowledge of God or good manners, in common of their goods, cattle, women, children, and every other thing. . .And hereof it followed that because their savage and idle life could not be satisfied with the only fruit of the natural unlaboured earth, therefore continually they invaded the fertile possessions of their Irish neighbours that inhabited the. . .English Pale.²

During its relatively brief career, the government

-
1. Dorothy Macardle, The Irish Republic (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1965), pp. 145-46.
 2. In Howard Mumford Jones, O Strange New World (New York: The Viking Press, 1964), p. 169.

of the United States of America has come down unerringly on the wrong side of virtually every issue in foreign affairs. Its record during the Irish rebellion was all too consistent with this bleak record. Rather than being favorable, or even neutral, toward the Irish struggle for freedom, that great Anglophiliac fighter for national self-determination and the rights of small nations, Woodrow Wilson, did his best to rivet the chains of oppression upon Ireland. Despite our supposed neutrality in the World War, agents of the U. S. Secret Service illegally raided the offices of the German Consul in New York on April 18, 1916, and there broke into and confiscated the files of correspondence. On finding news of the imminent Easter rising, the U. S. government lost no time in transmitting the information to the British Embassy, and this act of invasion and belligerence played an important part in crushing the initial stage of the rebellion. The resulting summary execution of the rebel leaders by the British may thus be partly laid to the door of the Wilson Administration.

America's entry into World War I provided the Wilson Administration with the opportunity to harass and persecute American friends of Irish liberation. Confiscated German documents were leaked to the press smearing Irish-American leaders. Particularly severe was the persecution of Jeremiah A. O'Leary. O'Leary was indicted by the Administration for conspiring to obstruct recruiting in the armed forces and to commit treason, and documents were released to the press charging him with being ready to commit sabotage on behalf of Germany. So ill that his trial had to be postponed, systematic brutalities were inflicted upon O'Leary in the Tombs prison. Finally acquitted in January, 1919, O'Leary was given a hero's welcome by thousands of Irish-Americans in New York City.

In the summer of 1917, the Friends of Irish Freedom circulated a petition in the United States for Irish independence. Woodrow Wilson's response was characteristic: ordering Secret Service agents to engage in rigorous examination of the finances of the Friends. Was their campaign financed by "German gold?"³ Neither were local governments hesitant about getting into the patriotic act. Peaceful meetings of the Friends in New York City were broken up by the police and by federal soldiers, who had been creative enough to

3. See Charles C. Tansill, America and the Fight for Irish Freedom (New York: Devin-Adair, 1957), pp. 233ff.

include the "preaching of sedition" in their definitions of "disorderly conduct" and "obstructing traffic." The Espionage Act was also invoked to break up pro-Irish meetings. The good, grey Anglophiliac New York Times hailed this "forward step" in preventing expressions of sedition; but, it sententiously hastened to add, "free speech, in a reasonable sense, will not be interfered with."⁴

But the implacable ruthlessness of the British Empire, assisted by its mighty U. S. ally, could not suffice to keep Ireland in thrall forever. The Irish Republic proclaimed by seven gallant and seemingly quixotic rebel leaders on Easter Monday, 1916, was destined to prevail, despite their execution by the vengeful British. Perhaps the best epitaph to these men was the deeply moving revolutionary speech delivered the previous August by the young lawyer and poet, Padraic Pearse, who was to read this proclamation of the Irish Republic and be named its President. Pearse's great speech was a eulogy at the funeral of the grand old Fenian rebel, Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, and the enthusiasm lit by Pearse at that eulogy may be considered the spark for the Easter Rising eight months later. Pearse had stirringly proclaimed:

. . .if there is anything that makes it fitting that I rather. . .than one of the grey-haired men who were young with him and shared in his labour and in his suffering, should speak here, it is perhaps that I may be taken as speaking on behalf of a new generation that has been rebaptised in the Fenian faith, and that has accepted the responsibility of carrying out the Fenian program. I propose to you then that, here by the grave of this unrepentant Fenian, we renew our baptismal vows; that, here by the grave of this unconquered and unconquerable man, we ask of God, each one for himself, such unshakable purpose, such high and gallant courage, such unbreakable strength of soul as belonged to O'Donovan Rossa. . .

We stand at Rossa's grave not in sadness but rather in exaltation of spirit that it has been given to us to come into so close a communion with that brave and splendid Gael . . .

In a closer spiritual communion with him now

4. H. C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite, Opponents of War, 1917-1918 (Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), p. 74.

than ever before or perhaps ever again, in spiritual communion with those of his day, living and dead, who suffered with him in English prisons, in communion of spirit too with our own dear comrades who suffer in English prisons today, and speaking on their behalf as well as our own, we pledge to Ireland our love, and we pledge to English rule in Ireland our hate. This is a place of peace sacred to the dead, where men should speak with all charity and all restraint; but I hold it a Christian thing, as O'Donovan Rossa held it, to hate evil, to hate untruth, to hate oppression, and hating them, to strive to overthrow them. Our foes are strong and wise and wary; but, strong and wise and wary as they are, they cannot undo the miracles of God who ripens in the hearts of young men the seeds sown by the young men of a former generation. And the seeds sown by the young men of '65 and '67 are coming to their miraculous ripening today. Rulers and Defenders of Realms had need to be wary if they would guard against such processes. Life springs from death; and from the graves of patriot men and women spring living nations. The Defenders of this Realm have worked well in secret and in the open. They think that they have pacified Ireland. They think that they have purchased half of us and intimidated the other half. They think that they have foreseen everything, think that they have provided against everything; but the fools, the fools, the fools!-- they have left us our Fenian dead, and while Ireland holds these graves, Ireland unfree shall never be at peace.⁵

5. Macardle, op. cit., pp. 136-37.

The Power of The President

The Liberals are, at last, beginning to wake up. For decades the Liberals and the Old Left have been regaling us with exaltation of the power, the glory, the grandeur of the President, especially in foreign and military affairs. The President was, uniquely and miraculously, the living embodiment of the Will of the People. Once every four years the individual American is allowed, nay exhorted, to troop to the polls, where he may pull down a lever beside the name of one out of two indistinguishable Personalities. After the winner is duly chosen by about one-fourth of the eligible electorate, the mantle of the Popular Mandate settles about his regal shoulders, and he is then to do as he pleases with us all until the hour of the next quadrennial extravaganza. The Liberals have been in the forefront of the advancement and glorification of this despotic process: anyone who dared to question or grumble at the burgeoning of unchecked power in the President was damned as an obstructionist, reactionary, and Neanderthal, heartlessly and wilfully attempting to block America's divinely-appointed path to her future destiny. And within the Pantheon of Presidents, the deified ones were the "strong" (i. e. war-making) Presidents--the Lincolns, the Wilsons, the Roosevelts, while the pacific and "do-nothing" Presidents were denigrated and scorned.

Too often it all depends on whose ox is being gored. World War II and the Korean "police action" were pre-eminently Liberal wars, and so the Liberals of course saw nothing wrong in them or in the Presidential powers that brought the wars about or were greatly intensified by the conflict. But the Vietnam War is a war of a different color, and many Liberals find that their chickens have truly come home to roost. Here and there Liberal voices are being raised, suddenly alarmed that some-

thing has gone wrong in the Paradise of presidential power.

The latest recruit to the growing body of the alarmed is the eminent Professor Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, quondam adviser to Presidents and diplomats, apostle of the Cold War and of hard-nosed realpolitik. More than most of his fellow Liberals, Morgenthau realizes not only that the Liberal-propelled process has gone too far, but even more that something is fundamentally wrong in the political system itself. Thus, Morgenthau laments that: "What the Founding Fathers feared has indeed come to pass: The President of the United States has become an uncrowned king. Lyndon B. Johnson has become the Julius Caesar of the American Republic."¹ Furthermore, Morgenthau recognizes that it is precisely the U. S. Constitution that has furnished the necessary framework for this appalling development. Morgenthau writes:

The objective conditions for the ascendancy of presidential powers have been long in the making; they only awaited a President willing and able to make full use of them. . .

Thus the stage was set for a new Caesar to bestride it. Only Caesar was missing. Presidents Truman and Kennedy could not fill the role because they were unable to manipulate Congress, and President Eisenhower, even though he created the administrative machinery of the contemporary presidency, was not interested in using it for the actual enlargement of the President's powers. It is the signal contribution Lyndon Johnson has made to American political life that he has taken advantage of the objective conditions of American politics with extraordinary skill and with an extraordinary taste for power. He has well-nigh exhausted the possibilities of power of the modern presidency, dwarfing the other branches of the government and reducing the people at large to helplessly approving bystanders.²

We welcome Professor Morgenthau to the anti-presidential ranks; but, as is generally the case with Liberals, his analysis is not thoroughgoing enough, and his posi-

1. Hans J. Morgenthau, "The Colossus of Johnson City", The New York Review of Books (March 31, 1966), p. 11.

2. Ibid., p. 12.

tive proposals are far less penetrating than his analysis. All he can offer is to call briefly for more exertions by Congress and for a return to the "checks and balances" supposedly envisioned by the Founding Fathers. For far more light as well as heat on the American Constitution we must turn to the great and eloquent Patrick Henry, a radical not a liberal, and a man whose root-and-branch opposition to the Constitution envisioned what sort of political system that document would promote. In the course of his fiery and determined opposition to the Constitution at the Virginia ratifying convention, Patrick Henry thundered:

This Constitution is said to have beautiful features; but when I come to examine these features, sir, they appear to me horribly frightful. Among other deformities, it has an awful squinting. It squints toward monarchy; and does not this raise indignation in the breast of every true American? Your President may easily become King. . . Where are your checks in this government? Your strongholds will be in the hands of your enemies. It is on a supposition that our American governors shall be honest, that all the good qualities of this government are founded; but its defective and imperfect construction puts it in their power to perpetrate the worst of mischiefs, should they be bad men; and, sir, would not all the world. . . blame our distracted folly in resting our rights upon the contingency of our rulers being good or bad? Show me that age and country where the rights and liberties of the people were placed on the sole chance of their rulers being good men, without a consequent loss of liberty! . .

If your American chief be a man of ambition and abilities, how easy is it for him to render himself absolute! The army is in his hands, and if he be a man of address, it will be attached to him. . . I would rather infinitely. . . have a King, Lords and Commons, than a government so replete with such insupportable evils. If we make a King, we may prescribe the rules by which he shall rule his people and interpose such checks as shall prevent him from infringing them; but the President, in the field, at the head of his army, can prescribe the terms on which he shall reign master, so far that it will puzzle any American ever to get his neck from under the galling yoke. . . But, sir, where is the existing force to punish him? Can he not, at the head of his army, beat down every opposition? Away with your President! we shall have a King! The army will

salute him monarch; your militia will leave you, and assist in making him King, and fight against you; and what have you to oppose this force? What will then become of you and your rights? Will not absolute despotism ensue?³

-
3. Available in Samuel Eliot Morison, ed., Sources and Documents Illustrating the American Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 330-31.

PEACE PLANS is a unique libertarian publication of plans for peace and individual freedom. Included are rare reprints. The series is intended to form an encyclopedia of peace plans.

Subscription rate is \$2 for 12 issues.

WRITE TO: **J. M. ZUBE**
Wilshire St., Berrima, N. S. W.
Australia

Labor Unionism, Two Views

If there was anything that characterized the Old Left it was adulation of labor unions, and of the process by which the government has created, maintained, cabined, and confined these unions to its will. Government control inevitably follows government privilege, and, as in the Fascist or Communist countries, privileged unionism has become in effect a powerful arm of the State apparatus for controlling the labor force and the economic system as a whole. Rather than representing their members, union leaders have been coopted into the power elite, there to serve as transmission belts for keeping the workers under the control of the various governmental "guidelines" (an apt term.)

While the Old Left has shown few qualms about this sorry condition of labor unionism, those on the Left who are not bemused by statism--notably on the New Left--have begun to see clearly the despotic role that trade unionism plays in present-day society. They are beginning to see also that the supposedly glorious acceleration of unionism attendant on the New Deal privileges of the 1930's was only glorious if one's ultimate goal is totalitarian dictation over the labor force. One of the most perceptive analyses of this development has just come to light: in a widely distributed reprint of an analysis of modern unionism by the left-wing anarchist Sam Weiner.¹

Weiner begins by noting that the Great Depression of the 1930's saw the final liquidation of the private enterprise system and its replacement by the present system

1. Sam Weiner, Ethics and American Unionism (New York: The Libertarian League, 1958), passages reprinted in Leonard I. Krimerman and Lewis Perry, eds., Patterns of Anarchy (New York: Anchor Books, 1966), pp. 286-288.

of "state capitalist 'welfarism'". The CIO was the essential instrument, created by the government, in effecting this transformation, and in "overcom(ing) the resistance of old-line capitalism" and the old-line craft unions. Finally, the "conservative unionists (of the AFL) had adjusted themselves to the fact that 'welfarism' was here to stay" and the AFL and CIO were ready to unite in harmony for "maximum centralization of control over the working class." Weiner then sums up the essential nature of American trade unionism and the American economy, of the present-day:

The character and function of the North American unions have changed greatly. A State-regulated economy needs a State-regulated labor movement. The government will help the unions so long as the leaders can assure the smooth cooperation of a docile labor force. The "Welfare State" has come to assume ever greater social functions and has intervened on an ever-greater scale in the control of economic and social life. It regulates, and shows an increasing tendency to dominate the whole field of social security, business, labor, crop and price supports, public power, housing, etc.

This process was expanded and accelerated by World War II, the Korean war, "defense" spending, foreign aid programs, and the prosecution of the "cold war." The bureaucratic administrative apparatus kept pace with the expansion of governmental power. Individual liberty and local initiative have diminished as the State domination of society has increased. The individual has had less and less to say about his own life and interests as the Government prescribes, to an ever greater degree, the conditions under which he must live. This process continues inexorably, regardless of the political party in power.²

Weiner then goes on to point out that the increasing usurpation of governmental power over the individual in society, has been matched by a corresponding usurpation of power by the union bureaucracy over the individual worker, aided and abetted by control of welfare funds, "the vicious practice of industrywide "collective bargaining" on a national scale, long-term contracts and the power to discipline dissidents among the members." Weiner concludes on this incisively penetrating note:

The State drives toward complete control of society.

2. Ibid., p. 287.

This is inherent in its nature. . . State capitalist "welfarism" is exploitation streamlined. AFL-CIO unionism is business unionism streamlined. The groundwork is being prepared for a future totalitarian society in the United States and the AFL-CIO already plays the role of "labor front" in the embryonic set-up. When the process is completed, as it will be if not stopped by working class resistance on a massive scale, the unions will end up by being as impotent as are the unions in Russia. During the whole period of the struggle against Fascism and "Communism", the basic features common to both of them have been or are being adapted for our own country.³

Now if there was anything that characterized the Old Right, it was its thoroughgoing hostility to any unionism privileged by the State apparatus: e.g. growing out of the NIRA or the Wagner Act. And yet it is instructive to contrast the foregoing brilliant denunciation of modern statist unionism by the pro-union Mr. Weiner with the recent lauding of modern unionism by the conservative editor, Dr. Howard Kershner, a long-time friend and aide of Herbert Clark Hoover. Dr. Kershner edits the fortnightly Christian Economics, a periodical supposedly devoted to championing the cause of a free-market economy. And yet we find in a recent issue Kershner worshipfully celebrating "The Statesmanship of George Meany!"⁴

What, we may ask, is the "high order of statesmanship," the "wisdom," the "great statesmanship," yea, even the "sound economics," that Dr. Kershner repeatedly and fawningly finds in George Meany? It boils down quite simply to this: that Mr. Meany has ever been willing and eager to place stringent maxima upon wage increases. In October, 1946, for example, Mr. Meany, along with William Green and the rest of the Executive Council of the AFL issued a report attacking any request for wage increases that would "break" price ceilings. Certain wicked unions outside the AFL (such as the steel union) persisted in ignoring the "wise" guidelines of that day and thus, according to Kershner, "started the wage-price spiral that has dogged the country ever since, resulting in the loss of 61 percent of the value of the consumer's dollar since 1946." Kershner then quotes from a statement by Meany that the AFL has always been opposed to basing wages on the "cost

3. Ibid., p. 288.

4. Howard E. Kershner, "The Statesmanship of George Meany," Christian Economics (April 19, 1966), pp. 1-3.

of living or on price inflation. The established wage policy of this country has been based on raising wages as increases in productivity made this possible. This is the only possible basis for an expanding economy with rising living standards." In short, as in President Johnson's "guidelines" today, wage increases are to be kept in line to correspond with the small general overall productivity increase, and never with larger price rises. Kershner exults over this Meany viewpoint:

This is sound economics. Mr. Meany is right. He occupies a strategic position in our country. . . Mr. Meany, you are the key to the situation. You have shown the statesmanship and the knowledge. We hope you will step into the breach and bring about a great reconciliation between workers and owners so that our beloved country may give the world a new and more impressive example of the great benefits to be derived from free market capitalism.⁵

Now, there is something very curious afoot here; as a devotee of free-market economics, Dr. Kershner should certainly be familiar with the fact that one of the great truths of that economics, taught in all the schools ranging from Ludwig von Mises to the Chicago School, holds that price inflation is always caused by an increase in the money supply. In particular, it is caused by bank credit expansion propelled by the central government. Price rises are not caused by particularly wicked groups in the market: by unions, businessmen, Jews, speculators, foreigners, or whatever, as governments have throughout history charged in order to take the blame and attention off governmental shoulders. Of all people, Dr. Kershner should be familiar with the statist trick of the guilty party (the government) demagogically leading the pack to pin the blame on some group within the society. Above all, he should not be playing this game himself. It should be clear to him that the wage-price spiral is caused by monetary inflation; yet monetary expansion is not so much as mentioned in the course of his paean to George Meany.

In fact, Kershner also displays ignorance of the important finding of such Chicago School economists as H. Gregg Lewis and Albert Rees: that the major effect of unionism and collective bargaining is to introduce rigidity into the wage-setting process. While it is true that during a depression this rigidity works to keep union wage rates higher than non-union rates, during a

5. Ibid., p. 3.

boom the process works the other way. In short, during an inflation, the rigidity of union contracts and collective bargaining causes union wage rates to lag behind the rise in non-union rates.⁶ Hence, far from unionism being culpable for price inflation, the truth is precisely the reverse: union-set wage rates lag behind the free-market rates during an inflation. Hence the sober lack of hysteria on the part of the Chicago economists about the impact of unions in causing allocation problems during a boom.

If, then, union wage rates lag behind non-union during a boom, this reveals in all its starkness the reason for the perpetual if moderate inflationism of the present state-capitalist system. The reason is precisely that frankly advocated by Lord Keynes, the economist-saint of modern state capitalism, and, it should be noted, of all the Old Left: to lower real wage rates by fooling the workers into thinking that their wages are rising when, in terms of real purchasing power, they are being lowered. Hence we see the acumen of Mr. Weiner's analysis of the current system of "state capitalist 'welfarism'": that the function of labor unionism in the system is to serve as the "labor front" for "maximum centralization of control over the working class." And, further, we see that the Keynesian-New Deal-Fair Deal-New Frontier-Great Society program of perpetual inflation is an integral part of this control and exploitation of the mass of workers. It begins to look as if Dr. Kershner's odd concept of the "free market" is yet another "front" for such control; this is the clear meaning of the paeans to the "labor statesmanship" of George Meany, a statesmanship that boils down to obeying the dictates of the State and herding the labor force into following the controls of "guidelines" dreamed up by our conservative-liberal collectivist rulers. The real free market is very different from all this; one of the main attributes of a truly free-market society would be the liberation of the unions, the workers, and all Americans from the despotism of federal guidelines, suggestions, or controls--their liberation, therefore, from all varieties of "labor statesmanship." And we might be permitted to hope for another if less important form of liberation: the liberation of free-market teachings from such alleged champions as Howard E. Kershner. Once again, Kershner's writings prompt us to ask: in what sense do present-day conservatives really favor the free-market?

6. Thus, see H. Gregg Lewis, Unionism and Relative Wages in the United States (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).

Cold War Revisionism: The Major Historical Task

One of the most vital struggles in the writing and publishing of history is the conflict between the government's propaganda myths, enshrined in "official history", and historical reality brought forward by "revisionism". In a time of foreign policy crisis the publishing of revisionist material is especially welcome; hence the importance of the recent all-revisionist issue of the quarterly Rampart Journal, as well as the publication of David Horowitz's study, The Free World Colossus.¹

Robert LeFevre's commentary in the revisionist issue of Rampart Journal is an estimable summary of the profound changes in ideological attitudes being forced upon

1. Particularly notable articles in the Rampart Journal are: Harry Elmer Barnes, "Revisionism: A Key to Peace", Rampart Journal (Spring, 1966), pp. 8-74; James J. Martin, "Revisionism and the Cold War, 1946-1966: Some Comments on its Origins and Consequences", ibid., pp. 91-112; and Robert LeFevre, "On the Other Hand," ibid., pp. 114-20. Also available from the journal is Barnes' important Select Bibliography of Revisionist Books, which can be obtained for 50¢ from Pine Tree Press, Box 158, Larkspur, Colorado 80118.

David Horowitz, The Free World Colossus (New York: Hill and Wang, 1965).

thinking people by the demands of developments in world affairs. On modern conservatism, LeFevre notes:

Traditionally, the world was divided by a series of vertical barriers erected around nations and called "national boundaries". Karl Marx sought to bring a revision in thinking by drawing a horizontal line and insisting that the world was actually divided between its classes. . .

The reaction against this attempt at revision, especially among conservatives, has been to reemphasize the national boundaries and to wage wars across them for economic reasons benignly cloaked in humanitarian terms calculated to elevate human sacrifice to the status of ultimate nobility. The military configurations and the geographic revisions emerging from this effort have done more to advance Marxist economics than the First, Second, and Third Internationals combined.²

Few people have analyzed the major contribution of the conservatives to the current catastrophic situation of the world. The conservative impulse toward aggressive violence, the waging of wars "for economic reasons benignly cloaked in humanitarian terms", has been the major international fact of the twentieth century. Revisionism's task is the destruction of the myths by which conservatives--i. e. governments and their supporters--obtain the people's acquiescence in aggressive violence. Revisionism substitutes for the conservative's vertical or State analysis a realistic horizontal or social analysis: "The world is not divided between those nations which are free and those which are not. The world is divided between those persons who seek to mind their own business and those who intend to mind the business of others by forceful interventions of every kind and description."³

LeFevre suggests that a "conservative movement" in the United States was formed by the crisis of Depression and New Deal. The possessors of power--the conservatives--were able to appropriate new labels by co-opting and rewarding the former liberal critics of that power. This process forced upon the opponents of New Deal imperialism, who had been called liberals and radicals when opposing the imperialism of Wilson and Hoover, the new label of "conservatives".

Thus, by the beginning of the 1940's the lines were

2. LeFevre, op. cit., pp. 115-16.

3. Ibid., p. 116.

drawn. The conservative view was in favor of peace, individualism, lower taxes, smaller government, independence, and self-reliance. . . The liberals, who rallied to Mr. Roosevelt's banner, proclaimed a new "deal" in which. . . America would intervene in all international affairs and assume a position of "world leadership".⁴

But this situation was soon altered by the development of anti-Communism, through which many conservatives completely abandoned their principles.

And with this shift came a strange metamorphosis to the conservative objective. For where it had served originally as the champion of peace, it now began to urge the line of "stand fast", "no compromise", "war if necessary". And where it had originally championed the idea of smaller government, it began to clamor for larger bureaus to hunt down Communists. It called for expansion of the police powers, sought laws to arrest persons of non-conservative persuasion on the grounds that they were "traitors", and clamored for costly "investigations". . . All at once the government became the most important thing in the mind of the conservative. The government must be made strong. It must spend billions in missile and weapon research. It must develop "strong men".

Gradually, the theory arose that the way to prevent a war with Russia was to start one. . .

Where conservatives had joined ranks in opposing the military draft of Roosevelt and in criticizing the draft of President Woodrow Wilson, they now joined hands in branding anyone who refused to be drafted as a "dupe" or an outright "red". Those who had opposed Roosevelt's brand of intervention now began to favor outright assistance to foreign countries which would oppose Russia. . .

What we now see within the framework of conservatism is a new alliance between former liberals and latter-day conservatives. The liberal of the 30's wanted larger government, principally in the area of social legislation, welfare, and human experiment. The latter-day conservatives also want larger government, but they now want it in the police area of armies, navies, air forces, and rocketry. They also want more trials, more rigid domestic policing.

4. Ibid., p. 118.

. . . The latter-day conservative, while still critical of the "welfare state" of the former liberal, lends his support to the formation of a military or a "police state" where things will be controlled at the top by a "strong man".

Meanwhile, another strange shift is occurring. For while some of the former liberals are intrigued by this turn of events and are now jumping on the bandwagon of "anti-communism", other liberals, in the nineteenth century tradition of liberalism, are beginning to wonder about human liberty in the great sense, and are shifting over to oppose war-making, the draft, foreign intervention, and even high taxes. Thus, it appears that the liberal camp, as well as the conservative camp, is splitting.⁵

Cold War revisionism reveals how the New Deal liberals--i. e., the sophisticated conservatives, as C. Wright Mills called them--were able to keep possession of power from World War II to the present day by enmeshing the "conservatives" in the new crusade of anti-communism. As LeFevre has indicated, it has taken a generation for "conservatives" to wake up to their betrayal by anti-communist liberal-conservatism, and to begin the necessary work of aligning with those liberals and radicals who have remained faithful to American liberalism's traditional opposition to the national power-structure.

The radical tradition, betrayed by the liberals' adherence to New Deal-Fair Deal imperialism, was exemplified by Eugene Debs. As Harry Elmer Barnes states in his magisterial exposition of revisionism, "Eugene Debs was imprisoned by Wilson. . . Debs' crime was a statement that the war had a primarily economic basis, precisely what Wilson himself declared in a speech on September 5, 1919."⁶ During the 1920's and 1930's, the truth about the precipitation of World War I by the US government and its allies was able to dispel the myths still propounded by the "patriots" of the American Legion and the Ku Klux Klan. But the situation after World War II has been vastly different. First, the US government learned from its post-World War I experience with revisionism, and took the necessary steps to thwart the development of revisionism in the future. Propaganda was carried out "not only with

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 118-20.

6. Barnes, "Revisionism: A Key to Peace," *op. cit.*, p. 12.

the connivance but with the active assistance of prominent officials such as J. Edgar Hoover and Colonel "Wild Bill" Donovan, the heads respectively of the FBI and the OSS (predecessor of the CIA).⁷ The government made sure that its myths would be propagated by official history, and there has arisen hardly any group with the courage to mount an opposition to this historical blackout. Barnes points out:

The anti-interventionist groups of 1937 and thereafter, like America First, were primarily conservative and for the most part welcomed the early revisionist publications. But they soon fell in line with the Cold War because of the business advantages in industry, trade and finance which an extravagant armament program and foreign aid provided. Thereafter, they feared or refused to give any open support, financial or otherwise, to a scholarly movement which undermined the cold-war assumptions as thoroughly as it did the interventionist mythology of 1939-41. Hence, revisionism since 1947 has not only been unpopular or ignored but also poverty-stricken.⁸

Until reality replaces the myths of official history, Barnes notes, the process of deeper and continuing American involvement in foreign interventions, like US aggression in Vietnam, will be found to intensify. However, Barnes does hope that some of the current younger generation will have the courage to smash through the official history, confront the system that perpetuates the Cold War, and hopefully dismantle it. But that generation will have to stand together and steel itself against the smears of the system's apologists and the betrayals of the unprincipled, smears and betrayals such as Harry Barnes has long experienced. As Barnes writes:

In this era of Nineteen Eighty-Four, "The Organization Man", . . . even the average American college graduate became little more inclined to independent thinking than was a Catholic peasant during the papacy of Innocent III. As Irving Howell pointed out in the Atlantic of November, 1965, American higher education conformed to the Orwellian cold-war system about as conveniently as the Pentagon or American business. When, in the mid-1960's, a small minority of students began to show signs of restlessness, this caused widespread surprise

7. Ibid., p. 20.

8. Ibid., pp. 38-39.

and alarm, and public leaders like Senator Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut suggested procedures which would have won them kudos from Hitler.⁹

Thus the New Left has become the contemporary repository and heir of the revisionism of the "Original Left" in America represented by Beard, Barnes, and Albert Jay Nock. For there exists what Barnes calls a "Lost Generation" in historical writing--the period when revisionism was in the hands of people who considered themselves "conservatives" and thus were not really committed to opposing the system threatened by revisionism. Hence, they did not truly support the efforts of those who did pursue revisionist study. But, as Barnes indicates, the Old Left failed even more starkly, for this was a Left that supported New Deal imperialism.

Also important was the failure of European historians to fulfill the role that they had admirably played after World War I. American scholars often tend to be conservative and timid; such attitudes make them natural allies of the Establishment in the furthering of official history. The attention of American scholars after World War I was directed to historical realities by the documentary and analytic work of European scholars whose work could not be ignored. The situation after World War II was totally different. The official Axis documents fell into the hands of the United States and Britain, which controlled their publication. The German, Italian and Japanese governments as the new allies of US imperialism have treated the publication of such documents as a crime and have discouraged revisionist scholarship.

Ultimately, the contradictions of the Cold War have begun to force a revisionist breakthrough in Europe, and have thus opened discussion of it in America. This breakthrough was accomplished by the English historian, A. J. P. Taylor, who had written imperialist propaganda in World War II. Taylor began his revisionism as an opponent of the Cold War. Thus, he shared the platform with Bertrand Russell at the February, 1958 meeting from which emerged the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Indeed, Taylor called on all opponents of imperialist aggression to confront Western political leaders with the cry of "Murderers!" Taylor, as in the case of so many advocates of disarming imperialism, had often been confronted with the canard that "Western democracy" must destroy communists just as it had

9. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

destroyed fascists in World War II. By a healthy re-examination of The Origins of the Second World War (1961) (a book termed by Barnes "a new epoch in revisionist historiography"), Taylor undercut the charge of German aggression as being responsible for World War II. Having cleared the air of such myths about the Second World War, revisionism is now in a position to undertake the main task of the present period, Cold War revisionism. As Barnes concludes, there is a direct link between the beginnings of the Cold War and the brutal act that ended World War II. As Barnes declares:

All other indefensible breaches of a humane code by either Hitler or the Allies were outdistanced by the atom bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. . . The documents now available prove that the bombings were ordered and were approved by Stimson as technological exhibitionism and were carried out primarily to impress and intimidate the Russians.¹⁰

James J. Martin's article in the Rampart Journal forms an important bridge to the new task of revisionist history. Martin directs attention to the imperialist basis of US aggression by taking as his theme a quote from a 1938 report by the Office of Naval Intelligence:

Realistically, all wars have been for economic reasons. To make them politically and socially palatable, ideological issues have always been invoked. Any possible future war will, undoubtedly, conform to historical precedent.¹¹

Martin notes that the Cold War did not begin as commonly dated with Churchill's repetition of Goebbels' "Iron Curtain" attack on the Soviets in March, 1946. Rather, the imperialists launched the Cold War before the completion of their war against Germany and Japan, even before the first meeting of the UN in San Francisco in April, 1945; it was launched by Winston Churchill against the popular forces resisting the Allied re-establishment of Greek reaction in November, 1944. The Cold War became what Charles A. Beard had described in his famous phrase as "perpetual war for perpetual peace". Martin's summary of the way that the Cold War was fastened upon the American people in the late 1940's is worth quoting at length:

10. Ibid., p. 72.

11. Ibid., p. 91.

Reluctance to enlist (in the Cold War) was seen from one end of the ideological spectrum to the other, from Senator Robert A. Taft and former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy to William Z. Foster, but, as in the case of the Second World War, emotions and sentiments favorable to belligerence did not respect political lines either, and were seen to crop up in all camps. A "left"-right coalition favorable to a "halt the spread of communism" policy was only a few months in the making, after a shaky start. Conservative politicians, members of the business world, and prominent church dignitaries soon found themselves cheek-by-jowl with ex-Communists, Trotskyites, Menshevik Social Democrats, Socialists, and contingents of the well-left-of-center totalitarian liberals, who had devised and produced most of the rationale behind American participation in the global bloodbath of 1941-1945. . .

A ponderous volume can be prepared on the early pro-Cold War literary propaganda alone. Some of the most widely read were ghost-written works by recent defectors to the "West" from the Soviet Union, mainly former military and political functionaries. But there were two particularly significant works which contributed to thinking of the showdown with the Communists on the level of global strategy, William C. Bullitt's The Great Globe Itself (New York: Scribner, 1946), and James Burnham's The Struggle for the World (New York: Day, 1947). These might have supplied most of the propaganda fuel for the Cold War by themselves, had no other works along such lines ever appeared.

. . . Bullitt, a prestigious diplomat during the Roosevelt era, had a well-known pedigree as an anti-Soviet strategist; his book contained the first dress rehearsal of the rationale of "containment". It was eclipsed by that of Burnham, whose background as a Marxist scholar and Trotskyite proponent disclosed no notable previous anti-Soviet works. Burnham's Struggle was published and reviewed the same month President Harry S. Truman announced his government's decision to take up the British "burden" of supporting the Greek and Turkish governments (March, 1947).

Despite owing a very heavy intellectual debt to Arnold J. Toynbee and his "challenge and response" theory, Burnham's book gained wide readership and was one of the first bridges thrown across to the American left and liberal-left to aid in mobilizing them in sub-

stantial numbers in behalf of the latest political offensive. It also had an important part to play in the sharp division of left-liberal politics, since many of the latter were most remiss about abandoning their decades of championing the post-1917 dispensation in Russia.

An example may be seen in the whooping enthusiasm for the Burnham thesis of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. in his review for The Nation (April 5, 1947, pp. 385, 398-99), though Schlesinger shuddered a bit at the thought of Burnham as secretary of state.¹²

Martin contrasts the Cold War propaganda of anti-Soviet Marxists, ex-Communists and socialists with the non-communist opposition to the Cold War represented by Walter Lippmann and former Congressman Hamilton Fish. Fish, a consistent isolationist, knew exactly what Truman, Marshall, Acheson, William Bundy, etc. were up to in the interventionist Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan: "Fish, one of the half-dozen best known opponents of American involvement in World War Two, though a fierce anti-Communist, attacked Truman's aid to Greece and Turkey 'containment' program as 'dollar imperialism'."¹³ The core of Cold War propaganda for interventionist "containment" and "dollar imperialism" was "the assemblage of ex-Reds, former Soviet well-wishers, and dis-affected Mensheviks who were published in the American Mercury during the editorship of Eugene Lyons, or in the Social Democrat weekly New Leader."¹⁴

Martin agrees that a striking failure of the political opposition to US imperialism and aggression has been its Europe-centeredness. US exploitation and hope of exploitation in Asia, especially in China, has been noted as the main basis for the Anglo-American alliance by which the US entered World War I. The proponents and opponents of US involvement in World War II debated the European war exclusively, while New Deal imperialism in the Administration and the China Lobby took the main chance in Asia. While Berlin and the German problem engaged public attention in the late 1940's and again in the 1960's, the Truman and Johnson Administrations and the China-Vietnam Lobby acted to unleash US aggression in Korea and Vietnam, the two classic invasion routes into China.

Martin concludes that since the Cold War is the princi-

12. Ibid., pp. 99-101.

13. Ibid., p. 102n.

14. Ibid., p. 102.

pal continuing obstacle to revisionism, a concentration on the Cold War is the principal duty of revisionist scholarship:

The Cold War has done more to hobble revisionism than all other influences and forces combined. It is for this reason that revisionism, if it is to have any significance henceforth, must not only become involved more deeply in investigations of how the world went to war again in 1939-41 and what really went on during that war, but also devote increasing attention to the Cold War and illuminate its spurious and artificial origins and dimensions.¹⁵

The beginnings of Cold War revisionism in the last works of Charles Beard were smothered in the avalanche of abuse poured upon all who questioned the myths of official history. It took a dozen years after Beard's works before important criticisms of US imperialism could make an appearance. The scars of the attacks on Beard by the official historians (about whom A.J.P. Taylor has said: "they are as much 'engaged' as though they wore the handsome uniforms designed for German professors by Dr. Goebbels") were not overcome until the courageous revisionism of William Appleman Williams' Tragedy of American Diplomacy (1959). Into the fresh area of Cold War revisionism Williams has been followed by the works of D. F. Fleming, John Lukacs, Herbert Aptheker, etc.

Even so, the unnecessary divisions caused by the mass desertion to support New Deal imperialism remain unhealed wounds, and the errors committed in the New Deal-Fair Deal decades have been institutionalized into dogmas. Thus, in his review of Williams' The Contours of American History, Dr. Aptheker (in Studies on the Left, Vol. III, No. 1, 1962) attacks Williams' refusal to view fascist countries as aggressive or expansionist when contrasted to the aggressive and expansionist aims and actions of New Deal imperialism. Aptheker says: "I would suggest that this is a reason why one has Mr. Williams expressing very warm feelings toward the isolationism of Charles A. Beard, in his last years, and towards Herbert Hoover." An irrational commitment to one or another aspect of US imperialism makes it difficult for many scholars to undertake the real task of Cold War revisionism, a task that requires the total rejection of US imperialism as exemplified in the works of Beard, Barnes and Williams.

Blindness to certain aspects of US imperialism was

15. Ibid., p. 112.

recently evidenced by a review in The Nation (Feb. 21, 1966), of David Horowitz's Free World Colossus by Arnold Kaufman of the philosophy department of the University of Michigan. Horowitz begins his work with a quote from William Appleman Williams: "Perhaps the major American casualty of the cold war has been the idea of history. This wound in the American intellect has, for the most part, gone unnoticed." It is doubtful, however, that Horowitz foresaw that this quote would be applicable to the "liberals" who have reviewed his own book (e.g. in the Nation, the New Republic.)

After criticizing Horowitz's rather lacklustre book for being too "exciting", Kaufman goes on to charge that it contains "three pervasive theoretical distortions." First, there is Horowitz's revisionist view that the use of US industrial capacity for the Cold War has been responsible for the current nationalization of the US economy. To Kaufman, that nationalization has been brought about simply by the "national response to the plight of the world's needy;" the Cold War thus being the conscious spearhead for US social welfare on a world-wide scale. It is unfortunate to find this point of view in the Nation; for it represents a reversion to the liberal, quasi-imperialist Nation of post-World War II. This was a myth taken up two decades ago by the ADA and adopted, in reverse, by the mindless right, which considers the collectivization of the economy since World War II as due solely to the growth of a welfare state. But, on the contrary, as pointed out years ago by Beard and Williams, the role of foreign aid and other aspects of the warfare-welfare tax-burden upon the American people has been the enrichment of the state monopoly system in the United States.

Secondly, Kaufman insists that the adoption of the Cold War by America was a response to "the nature of Stalinism, and to the experiences many good people had with domestic communism during the Thirties." As though the domestic policies of forced industrialization in the Soviet Union or of support for the New Deal in America can plausibly be offered as an excuse for US aggression in the Cold War! Thirdly, Kaufman attacks Horowitz's--and the New Left's--failure to "play the (liberal) U. S. political game," e.g. for his obvious preference for Eisenhower over the more war-mongering Harry Truman.

The Nation had promised to print in a subsequent issue the response of David Horowitz to this unfortunate review, as well as a reply by Kaufman. But nothing of the

sort has appeared, and it is clear that The Nation has decided not to allow Horowitz to answer the Kaufman attack. This is a disquieting setback for the cause of Cold War revisionism, for the Nation in the past several years had begun to return to the high standards of revisionism achieved by its pre-1930's editor Oswald Garrison Villard, who was later barred from the magazine for opposing the forward rush of US aggression in World War II. Furthermore, the review itself is an apt commentary on the weaknesses of the potentially dynamic teach-in movement, of which Professor Kaufman was one of the founding fathers.

In March, 1966, the libertarian-pacifist magazine Liberation celebrated its tenth anniversary, an anniversary which should not go unnoticed, considering the importance of the journal for Cold War revisionism. Edited by Dave Dellinger, Paul Goodman, Sidney Lens, and A. J. Muste, Liberation has among its permanent contributors Kenneth Boulding, Erich Fromm, Staughton Lynd, Lewis Mumford, William L. Neumann, Linus Pauling, and Kenneth Rexroth. For this anniversary, Liberation reprinted its "Tract for the Times" from its first issue. Liberation's viewpoint, that editorial made clear, would be based upon the Judaeo-Christian tradition, pacifist and non-violence philosophies, libertarian movements, and the American tradition of "Jefferson, Paine, Thoreau, Emerson, Debs, Randolph Bourne." Thus, Liberation declared: "The national, sovereign, militarized and bureaucratic State and a bureaucratic collectivist economy are themselves evils to be avoided or abolished. . . Our emphasis is rather on possibilities for decentralization, on direct participation of all workers or citizens in determining the conditions of life and work. . ."

The original Liberation world-view, influenced by Gandhi and Indian "neutralism", was marred by an unthinking Third Camp position that weakened its struggle against US imperialism. But Liberation has since evolved out of a negative Third Camp approach. Staughton Lynd's articles, for example, have been invaluable in clearing the air. Thus, in the anniversary issue he effectively answers the critics of his statements made in Hanoi last January:

When I said in Hanoi that American policy in Vietnam was "illegal, immoral and antidemocratic", I said something which to the best of my knowledge as a scholar and historian was true. I believe I can document each contention. . . But when Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. recently said that he, when in government during

the Bay of Pigs crisis, had deliberately lied, but that he hoped he would be forgiven for acting in the public interest, I noticed no statement from the President of Harvard condemning Mr. Schlesinger for violating the most elementary precept of intellectual integrity. It would seem then, that for one historian to lie in Washington is almost patriotism, while for another to try and tell the truth in Hanoi, is almost treason.

It is upon such a spirit of scholarship and devotion to the truth that historical revisionism is built.

One of Liberation's major contributions to revisionism was made by its publication of two significant articles by Harry Elmer Barnes: "Revisionism and the Promotion of Peace" (Summer, 1958), the subsequent Symposium on Revisionism in its October and November, 1958 issues, and Barnes' "Revisionism Revisited" (Summer, 1959). Barnes' first article was reprinted by Peace News in England, and translated on the Continent, but Dr. Luigi Villari failed in his attempts to have it reprinted in Italy. Professor D. F. Fleming, the Dean of Cold War Revisionism and a major foundation for the Horowitz book, commented thus on Barnes' article: "The case of the Revisionists deserves to be heard. They may help us avoid the 'one more war' after which there would be nothing left worth arguing about." Harry Paxton Howard's contribution to the Symposium was particularly prophetic in his recognition that the wars of Roosevelt and Truman provided the basis for such later wars as Lyndon Johnson's: "Every effect of the Roosevelt War contained the seeds of further war. We have already had one in Korea--and President Truman did not even bother to ask Congress for a declaration. We can have another one any time the warlords in Washington so decide."

It is not surprising that Barnes found the comments of Professor William L. Neumann among the most significant, especially the "vigor with which Professor Neumann exposes the lack of logic, consistency, realism, and good sense on the part of those who were ardent Revisionists with respect to the first and second World Wars but are now in the vanguard of those who are whooping it up for planetary destruction in a third World War." Barnes pointed out that the overwhelming majority of the old leaders of the America First movement were now far more interested in America's "Third Crusade" than in any revisionist revelations on the second World War. He noted a few honorable exceptions

such as Bruce Barton and Hamilton Fish, "who spoke out boldly against Mr. Dulles' apparent willingness to launch the final war of nuclear extermination to enable Chiang Kai-shek to linger on gracefully and comfortably at the American 'farm club' in Formosa."

Harry Barnes, in his Rampart Journal essay, ends on a bleakly pessimistic estimate of the chances for the future acceptance of revisionism. But his own and the Martin articles in this issue, as well as the recent emergence of Rampart Journal itself, is just one of the important straws in the wind for a far more optimistic prognosis. And a particularly important development has been the emergence of revisionist ideas and scholarship on the New Left, and in major works of recent years by such historians as Gar Alperovitz, David Horowitz, James J. Martin, William L. Neumann, and William Appleman Williams. And recently, a brilliant young New Left historian was heard to praise the Union Party of 1936 as isolationists and radicals who refused to be co-opted into the New Deal system of imperialism and state monopoly. For the success of revisionism, it may well be later than we think,

Readers might be interested in a new

AGCOMM DIRECTORY ONE

an annotated looseleaf directory of
libertarian periodicals, of extreme
range and diversity.

Cost is \$2.00 a copy

For information, write to:

**Agoric Communications of
Southern California
Box 2116, Santa Monica, Calif.**

Our First Anniversary

This issue marks the beginning of the second year of the publishing of LEFT AND RIGHT. If the Nation can celebrate its centennial and National Review its tenth year of existence, we may be permitted a modest celebration of our own first anniversary. In a sense, our own longevity is already more remarkable than theirs. We began as an act of faith, a leap in the dark, unblessed then or now by the largesse of Boston Brahmins, oil millionaires, advertising by the military-industrial complex, or indeed by any donations whatever. So far we have been able to bear this condition without complaint, and without sending periodic pleas and exhortations for funds to our subscribers. But not only have we always existed on a shoestring; we did not begin, as did the other publications, as full-blown representatives of a flourishing popular and intellectual movement. We began with no eager army of laissez-faire liberal readers, as did the Nation, or of embattled Conservatives, as did National Review. In fact the main reason for our birth was a conviction by our editors and a tiny handful of colleagues that it was not possible that we could be the only people in the country with our particular political and ideological position. Hence our launching as a leap in the dark, as an almost desperate search for people who agree or might come to agree, in whole or in significant part, with our ideological outlook. LEFT AND RIGHT began, not in answer to the clamor of an eagerly receptive market of readers, but in a fervent search for a market that should be there, but which seemed to be non-existent. In particular, we hoped to be able to detach individualist libertarians from their thralldom to a Conservative Movement that had become the major enemy of their own ideals and principles; and, furthermore, to try to infuse into the often instinctively libertarian New Left an increased knowledge of economics and an appreciation of a truly free-market economy.

We must say that while we hoped for a modicum of success, we expected none at all; and that, in our short span, we have succeeded beyond our wildest dreams. The response from all sides to our fitful efforts, efforts without benefit of advertising budget, has been truly remarkable. We have had enthusiastic expressions of approval and support from people of all manner of occupations and ideological positions: from economists, historians, sociologists, philosophers, journalists, and editors; from unemployed scholars, trade union officials, and foundation and trade association executives; from engineers, accountants, businessmen, and school teachers; from libertarians, left and right, from pacifists, isolationists, anarchists (left, right, and center), voluntary communalists, ex-Wobblies, Egoists, autarchists, creative Marxists, neo-Maoists, Irish nationalists, Birchers, classical liberals, and thinking Conservatives; from atheists, agnostics, Protestants, Jews, Catholics, and Jesuits. Most important of all is the enthusiasm we appear to have sparked in groups of college students across the country: in colleges and universities in New York, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Illinois, Kansas, and California, eager groups of students have coalesced around an emphatic and determined Left/Right orientation. In quite a few cases, these are former leaders of YAF or ISI who have now joined SDS or local Free Universities.

Evidence of an extensive impact for our fledgling journal has already found its way into print. A conservative newsletter that likes to think of itself as libertarian has grumpily complained that we have "monopolized" the libertarian name. In the Daily Tar Heel, student newspaper at the University of North Carolina, Wilson Clark, Jr. has developed an explicitly Left/Right position. And our magazine and its position were hailed in the New Republic by Professor Ronald Hamowy of the history department of Stanford University, in commenting on a series of articles by young radicals of the present-day.¹

Throughout the land, heartening evidence continues to mount that a market does exist for our efforts, that enough individualists have become uneasy with the New Conservatism and enough leftists critical of the centralized State to provide the basis for a genuine ideological realignment in this country.

-
1. Ronald Hamowy, "Left and Right Meet," The New Republic (March 12, 1966), pp. 14-16, and Wilson Clark Jr., "Common Ground for Right and Left," The Daily Tar Heel (April 13, 1966), p. 2.

Hiroshima Reconsidered

By WILLIAM L. NEUMANN*

The generation born since World War II and now surging through college classrooms views with less awe than its elders that event which Harry Truman proclaimed on August 6, 1945, as "the greatest thing in history". Students glimpse the possibility that nuclear weapons may determine their own life span, but the bombs tend to be accepted, like television and transistor radios, as normal facts of life, a part of the environment of modern society.

Acceptance of the threat of nuclear warfare has not stilled this generation's curiosity about the decision to try to end the Pacific war with a mass cremation of Japanese. Many students, after reviewing the available facts, are unable to comprehend or accept the official justifications for the American decision. This skepticism will now be intensified by two recent volumes which reexamine the thinking that surrounded the first use of atomic weapons.¹

* William L. Neumann is professor of history at Goucher College, Maryland, and author of America Encounters Japan.

1. Len Giovannitti and Fred Freed, The Decision to Drop the Bomb (New York: Coward-McCann, 1965). 348 pp. \$6.00.
Gar Alperovitz, Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965). 317 pp. \$7.50.

Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam is the work of Gar Alperovitz, who took an undergraduate degree in history at the University of Wisconsin, a master's degree in economics at Berkeley and a doctorate in political economy at Cambridge. Writing with a very strong thesis which at times is stretched too far, Alperovitz has produced a scholarly work from the great mass of printed materials as well as using the few manuscript collections now available. Len Giovannitti and Fred Freed are television writers, drawn into producing The Decision to Drop the Bomb as a result of their research on two N.B.C. documentaries. Their bibliography lists most of the standard secondary works along with over fifty interviews of American and Japanese individuals who had some role in the bomb decision or the surrender. Although their volume is in great part made up of quotes, their sources are not clearly identified either by footnotes or in the text. Many of those interviewed had already written books or articles on the subject and the interviewing technique seems to have been too conventional, failing to raise the kind of searching questions that might have elicited new information or fresh interpretations. Within these limitations, however, The Decision to Drop the Bomb is a good introduction to the current state of knowledge on this subject. While Alperovitz's volume attempts to revise the conventional view, Giovannitti and Freed in the end accept the prevailing interpretation but their book provides materials for a revision.

The official view of the purpose of the elimination of two Japanese cities is that upheld by Harry Truman in his memoirs: that the bomb was dropped to save the lives of American boys who were expected to die in an invasion. As the years have passed and Japanese have acquired status as a "friendly people", the intention has been broadened to include the saving of Japanese lives as well. Truman emphasized this point a few years ago when he was visited by a Japanese delegation of survivors. Winston Churchill in his Triumph and Tragedy volume stated the official intention far more eloquently, "To avert a vast, indefinite butchery, to bring the war to an end, to give peace to the world, to lay healing hands upon its tortured peoples by a manifestation of overwhelming power at the cost of a few explosions." Some of the scientists involved in producing the bomb have affirmed the same viewpoint, notably Karl Compton and James B. Conant, both members of the Interim Committee that weighed the bomb's use. Robert Oppenheimer also seems to fall in this group with his statement to Giovannitti and Freed that

"the decision was implicit in the project", claiming that the makers of the bomb always assumed that it would be used.

Estimates as to the number of lives expected to be lost in the Japanese invasion vary. Churchill claimed that the conquest of Nippon "might well require" the loss of a million Americans and half that number of British. Truman in his memoirs reported that General Marshall had told him that it might cost a half a million lives to force Japan's surrender on its own soil. If estimates were made of expected Japanese deaths they have not as yet been published. American military plans contemplated the invasion of the most southern of the major islands, Kyushu, in November of 1945, with a possible American casualty list of thirty to forty thousand. The central plain of Tokyo was to be invaded in 1946 and mopping up operations in Japan completed in 1947.

Among supporters of the decision to drop the bomb there is also a secondary argument for the necessity of this action. In view of the investment of two billion dollars of the taxpayers' money in the atomic project, it is claimed that the Roosevelt and Truman administration had to act to prove the value of this expenditure. If the bombs were not used and their existence concealed, Congress would have eventually uncovered the decision and the critics of the administration - presumably the Republicans - would have had a powerful weapon with which to berate their opponents. In an age when many more billions are gambled on a very questionable race to the moon and when each misfire costs the taxpayer millions such sensitivity to wartime waste on the part of the voter seems less credible, but both James Byrnes and General Leslie Groves clearly had this consideration in mind.

The case of the doubters and critics rests heavily on the information available to Washington that Japan was close to surrender before Hiroshima. Despite the valiant fighting on Okinawa the will to continue the war was reported to be fading rapidly by a number of intelligence sources. The Japanese Navy had ceased operations and the Air Force was severely decimated, with oil shortages grounding most of the surviving planes. Peace feelers had been made to Moscow in the spring of 1945 and their existence communicated to Washington. As the U. S. Strategic Bombing Survey concluded after their postwar study of Japanese morale: "From the standpoint of the politics of surrender -

and by August 1945 politics was the key - the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was not essential." Air Force General Curtis LeMay, whose bombers had killed more Japanese in their fire raid on Tokyo than did the first atomic bomb, was certain that he would run out of targets and out of a war by September of 1945.

There can be little doubt that there was some realization of Japan's imminent collapse on the highest levels of government by the summer of 1945. "Japan is doomed and the Japanese know it," Harry Hopkins informed the White House from Moscow in late May. Even General Eisenhower, busy with occupation problems in Europe, claims that he knew that Japan was defeated and that dropping the bomb was unnecessary. In Mandate for Change he reports the visit of Secretary of War Stimson to Europe, informing the General of the plan for bombing Japan. Stimson is remembered as being "deeply perturbed" and "almost angrily refusing" the reasons Eisenhower offered for his belief that the bomb was not needed to save American lives and would only shock world opinion. Admiral William Leahy, Chief of Staff to the President, and one who doubted that the bomb would even explode, also claimed that Japan was already defeated because of the effective sea blockade and conventional bombing.

This evidence is basic to the belief that there was another reason, or at least an additional reason, for using the bomb on Japan. One of the earliest to set forth another thesis - if not the first to do so - was P.M.S. Blackett, the British physicist and Nobel prize winner. Writing in 1948, Blackett claimed that the nuclear bombing was not so much the last act of the Second World War as it was the first major operation of the Cold War against the Soviet Union. This view, strongly upheld by Alperovitz, has two phases: one, that the use of the bomb was intended to end the Pacific War before the Russians moved into China and by a declaration of war acquired a claim to sharing the occupation of Japan. The second phase of the argument is that the bomb was also intended as a demonstration of American power that would make the Russians more amenable to accepting American policies in Eastern Europe and the Balkans.

Keeping the Russians from implementing their Yalta pledge to enter the war against Japan was no doubt a consideration that weighed heavily in Washington. Churchill also took note of it, and in discussing the bomb de-

cision in Triumph and Tragedy he says: "Moreover, we should not need the Russians. . . We had no need to ask favours of them." Alperovitz offers a great deal of evidence of the growth of influence of the "hard-line" proponents, both political and military men, who found in President Truman a receptive mind. Each difficulty with Russia encountered by American policy in Europe convinced these men of the importance of keeping Stalin from playing any role in Asia and particularly in the occupation of Japan.

There is more difficulty in assessing the importance of the bomb's use as a modern version of the old sword-rattling technique in an effort to scare the Kremlin. Jonathan Daniels, son of Josephus, Wilson's Secretary of the Navy and a White House aide, has recorded what is the most unambiguous record of Truman's thinking. According to Daniels, when Truman discussed the bomb he said: "If it explodes, as I think it will, I'll certainly have a hammer on those boys." Leo Szilard, the physicist, reports a similar expression of hope on the part of Byrnes, who said that the major purpose of the bomb was to "make Russia more manageable in Europe."

The initiative in launching the Cold War consequently seems no longer so one-sidedly attributable to the Kremlin. Already, on April 20, 1945, Averill Harriman told Truman that the United States was faced with a "barbarian invasion of Europe". The historian might wonder what the indictment of the Russians would have been if they had stopped their warfare against the Germans on the 1939 Polish-German frontiers and left the bloody task of taking Berlin to the British and Americans. Harriman and other hard-line advisers of Truman seem to ground the greatest source of their hostility in the Russian insistence upon installing their own hand-picked government in Poland. The White House seems to have had no important adviser whose historical knowledge recalled the attempt of the victors in 1919 to install a cordon sanitaire in Eastern Europe. A little history and a little insight might have suggested that the Russians would view any British and American interference in Eastern Europe as a new effort to rebuild the structure that had collapsed at least by 1938. A little understanding of the behavior of great powers would also have suggested that the Russians, having bled to the extent of over seven million combat dead, would be determined to install their own cordon sanitaire in those countries that had fallen so quickly to Nazi Germany.

Reading Alperovitz raises an even more basic question about the nature of changes in American policy. For some important members of the Truman administration in 1945 Poland and the rest of Eastern Europe were significant enough areas for American national interests to risk launching a third world war and disrupting the United Nations at its very inception. As Truman said, if the Russians did not play ball and did not wish to join us in the United Nations - on American terms, of course - "they could go to hell". Yet, only a few years before, in 1938 and 1939, when there had been some opportunity to fight to maintain a skeleton of the 1919 settlement, none of these voices were raised to propose American intervention. Truman had been typical of a kind of unintellectual middlewestern isolationist who, as late as June of 1941, had greeted with glee a Russo-German conflict as weakening both of these powers.

What radical change in the role of Poland or in the American mind made a war over Poland unthinkable for American leaders in 1939 but easily contemplated in 1945? Was it the vaguely forming concept of a Pax Americana that made all areas of the world open to the influence of the rival great power of almost equal vital importance to American eyes? John Lukacs, in his brief study of the origins of the Cold War, makes a good case for the view that postwar Soviet Russian national interests have greater congruity with those of Tsarist Russia than have the 1945 and post-1945 assessments of American national interests with those of 1935. The great revolution in world affairs might well be considered the new role chosen by the United States. In this change, the creation and use of the atomic bomb, as these two recent volumes suggest, was a central factor. An important area of revisionism is being opened up by this new thesis or set of theses. Like most revisionism in international affairs, the new thesis must fight the "good nation vs. bad nation" oversimplifications which nationalism tries to impose upon scholarship and which often makes unpopular the struggle for truth and objectivity.

Early Anti-Imperialism

By LEONARD P. LIGGIO

The anti-imperialist American youth of today are, without realizing it, following in a great tradition of modern anti-imperialism inaugurated during the burgeoning of US imperialism at the time of the Spanish-American War. This applies not only to the opposition as a whole, but even to such tactics as agitating among US troops against the war effort. This heritage applies also to what the statist ideologues of National Review have perceptively called the "anarchist impulse", which they discern at the root of American youth's support of Negroes or Vietnamese oppressed or assaulted by the US State-apparatus. For Conservatives, out of their irreconcilable conflict with libertarians, recognize that isolationism and anti-imperialism in foreign policy is but the other side of the coin of "anarchism" in domestic affairs.

The United States initiated its aggression against Spain on April 20, 1898. The immediate object: to restore stability in Cuba for the benefit of US owners of plantations, mines and other vestiges of feudalism, and to prevent the success of the Cuban revolutionary movement. But the major focus of US aggression had already become the Far East, where the U. S. Asian Squadron, conveniently located at Hong Kong to dominate the South China Sea, made haste to occupy Manila Bay on May 2--considerably before the annexation of Hawaii (July 7) or the occupation of Santiago, Cuba (July 17). In the Far East, the US quickly replaced Spain as the imperialist oppressor of the Philippines national liberation movement. American libertarians had no hesitation then in giving every aid and support to those fighting against the US aggressors, and in urging Americans to disassociate themselves actively from the criminality of the US government. In the absolute forefront of the

anti-imperialist confrontation with the US State-apparatus was the dean of American laissez-faire liberals, the businessman-advocate of free trade and hard money, Edward Atkinson, who founded the American anti-imperialist movement.

The Philippine situation led to the most sensational episode in the history of the movement, the seizure of the Atkinson pamphlets. . .

Long the ardent champion of a score of reforms, Atkinson began writing, publishing, and distributing violent anti-imperialist pamphlets in the fall of 1898. This, of course, was no more than was being done by a dozen other enthusiasts in the movement. In the spring of 1899, however, he wrote to the secretary of war, enclosing his three principal pamphlets, and declaring his intention of sending them to American soldiers in the Philippines. . .

The government acted at once. On May 2, 1899, Postmaster-General Charles Emory Smith ordered the San Francisco postmaster to remove all Atkinson pamphlets from the Manila mails. A number of the offending documents were intercepted the following day. This action aroused great interest throughout the United States. The anti-imperialists rushed to Atkinson's defense, the Springfield Republican finding in the seizure "the mailed hand of the rule of blood and iron being gradually disclosed. . . which," it added, "will next fall heavily upon freedom of speech within the old borders of the United States". The postmaster general defended his order in sharp words, and was supported by most of the imperialist press.¹

Edward Atkinson, along with William Graham Sumner, was the most widely known American exponent of pure liberalism. Atkinson (1827-1905) came to maturity in the most significant period of American intellectual history, the pre-Civil War Jacksonian era. Carl Schurz, radical German refugee from the 1848 Revolution, declared of America in the 1850s:

Every glance into the political life of America strength-

-
1. Fred Harvey Harrington, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States", Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXII (1935), in Frank Freidel and Norman Pollack, eds. Builders of American Institutions, (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), p. 365.

ens my convictions that the aim of a revolution can be nothing less than to make room for the will of the people - in other words, to break every authority which has its organization in the life of the state, and, as far as is possible, to overturn the barriers to individual liberty. . . Here in America you can see every day how slightly a people needs to be governed. In fact, the thing that is not named in Europe without a shudder, anarchy, exists here in full bloom.²

An abundance of authors, of whom Thoreau, Emerson, and Parker were foremost, provided the intellectual analysis for the instinctive and popular no-government philosophy of the Jacksonian era. Opposing all work within State-oriented institutions, they stood outside of them, and called for their total abolition on the basis of absolute moral principles. They not only called for it, they actively worked at it by giving support to the internal revolutionary activists of whom John Brown is justly the most famous. Thoreau, Emerson, and Parker became fully radical when they collected funds to purchase arms, "Beecher's bibles", to overthrow the slave system maintained by the US government.

The grounds for this new resistance to society as order and discipline might be narrower than Emerson would have liked, but rebellion against a pro-slavery government could be a first step in making radical individualism something more than just a literary fancy or a prerogative of isolated genius. Perhaps the time was approaching when every individual would realize that he had no further need of laws and governments. Following the lead of Thoreau, who had first made transcendentalism the basis for defying law in his doctrine of civil disobedience, Emerson passed from a theoretical anti-institutionalism to something approaching straight-out anarchism.³

Unfortunately, slave insurrectionism was side-tracked by the US power structure into governmental aggression and aggrandizement in the Civil War, which ended with the Negroes still defrauded of their rights and the property which they had created during generations of enslaved labor. However, the tradition of this radicalism remained a strong undercurrent in nineteenth century America.

2. George M. Fredrickson, The Inner Civil War (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 8.

3. Ibid., p. 39.

Edward Atkinson gained his theoretical self-education during this period. He was strongly and totally influenced by the writings of Frederic Bastiat, whose economic writings correcting the errors of Ricardo and Malthus had become important from 1850 on. Atkinson was an Abolitionist in the Garrison tradition, placing moral and political principles above traditional forms and mechanisms. His attitude toward the continued growth of government support of slavery was indicated in February, 1850: "I say damn compromise, if compromise - damn union."⁴ However, he did not limit himself to declamations. Atkinson immediately joined Theodore Parker's Boston Vigilance Committee, which liberated Negroes from federal authorities seeking to restore them to slavery. And, as befitted the most successful New England textile manufacturer, Atkinson was the treasurer of the committee that equipped John Brown's guerrillas in Kansas with weapons and ammunition. During the Civil War Atkinson was the secretary of the Educational Commission, which sought to bridge the failure of the government to leave to the Negroes the confiscated plantations by raising voluntary contributions to gain the properties for the Negroes. Throughout the post-Civil War period Atkinson was convinced that there was an intimate relation between the betrayal of Negro civil and property rights under Reconstruction, and the system of pillage of the general public by government privileges, subsidies, tariffs, and inflation. He fought to end the privileges of tariffs, government-protected banking, and currency. In 1867 he stated: "Capitalists, speculators, and middlemen are stealing the share of annual product which under natural law belongs to labor, by the use of false money (greenbacks)"; while in 1891 he noted: "For the purpose of passing a Force Bill the Republicans have admitted into the Senate the Senators from the so-called 'rotten borough states' (western states);. . . They have sold out the Republicans on the Force Bill for the purpose of gaining a benefit to the silver mines."⁵ However, when the exploitation of the general public by speculators and contractors through inflation, privileges and subsidies, and of the Negroes by denial of civil and property rights, was escalated to a higher stage of imperialism, Edward Atkinson was prepared to escalate his opposition to government, despite his advanced age of seventy years and his social position as the leader of industrial fire insurance.

4. Harold Francis Williamson, Edward Atkinson: The Biography of an American Liberal, 1827-1905 (Boston: Old Corner Book Store, Inc., 1934), p. 4.

5. Ibid., pp. 83, 157.

Senator William Borah, perhaps the premier American anti-imperialist, well summarized the contradictions between imperialism and liberty during his own crusade against the imperialist Versailles Treaty and League of Nations:

You can not yoke a government whose fundamental maxim is that of liberty to a government whose first law is that of force and hope to preserve the former. These things are in eternal war, and one must ultimately destroy the other. You may still keep for a time the outward form, you may still delude yourself, as others have done in the past, with appearances and symbols, but when you shall have committed this Republic to a scheme of world control based upon force. . . you will have soon destroyed the atmosphere of freedom, of confidence in the self-governing capacity of the masses, in which alone a democracy may thrive. . . And what shall it profit us as a Nation if we shall go forth to the dominion of the earth and share with others the glory of world control and lose that fine sense of confidence in the people, the soul of democracy?⁶

In that same speech Borah singled out the US government's protection of the feudal concessions controlled by US interests in Venezuela in 1895, as the origin of the Imperialism that has dominated American foreign policy ever since. The revival of the Monroe Doctrine in 1895 after decades of disuse signalled the beginning of the aggressions that US imperialism would undertake.⁷ Atkinson was galvanized into action by the monstrosity of reviving the Monroe Doctrine; for the implicit militarism, especially naval construction, would introduce through the backdoor the subsidies, privileges, government contracts to business and the currency in-

6. Freidel and Pollack, op. cit., p. 423.

7. It has often been suggested that the outward thrust of US imperialism coincided with the closing of the internal American frontier. Few have noted, what nineteenth century anti-imperialists well knew, that there was not any noteworthy rise in US blood-thirstiness; for the blood-thirst formerly expended in the slaughter of the native Indian tribes now found insufficient release in the growing lynching of Negroes, and was turned toward the black and brown peoples of the Caribbean and the Far East. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that racism stands at the root of US imperialism, militarism, and the conscription system.

flation which libertarians had been combatting for years. Charles Eliot Norton, the Harvard professor, said of our policy in Venezuela: "I fear that America is beginning a long course of error and wrong and is likely to become more and more a power for disturbance and barbarism", while to E. L. Godkin he wrote of the rise of "a barbaric spirit of arrogance and unreasonable self-assertion."⁸ Godkin, editor of The Nation and the New York Evening Post, was an intransigent defender of laissez-faire liberalism, sound money, Negro rights, and anti-militarism, as were such of his associates as Carl Schurz, Oswald Garrison Villard and Edward Atkinson. It was to Godkin's Post that Atkinson wrote his first anti-imperialist blast (January 8, 1896), in which he offered the best practical means of distinguishing between true supporters of peace and proponents of war:

A question has arisen as to whether Jingoism is a chronic disease affecting any great number of persons or only a superficial eruption or eczema developed by the itching for notoriety of a few persons who occupy but do not fill high positions, irritating but not dangerous. A conclusion could be easily reached upon these two phases of the question by drawing up a petition to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States somewhat in the following form:

"It is requested that an act may be passed to the effect that any citizen of the United States who proposes to force this country into a war with Great Britain or with any other country on a dispute about boundaries or any other similar issue, shall be immediately conscripted or entered upon the army roll for service from the beginning to the end of any such war when it shall occur. It is suggested that Senators of the United States shall be assigned to the position of general officers in this addition to the army upon the ground that their military capacity must certainly be equal to their political intelligence. . . It is next suggested that Representatives in Congress shall be assigned to the command of brigades upon the ground that their capacity to lead military bodies had been proved by their capacity to mislead civil organizations. It is suggested that all other persons such as the heads of police departments and the like shall be ranked in the

8. Barbara W. Tuchman, "The First Anti-Imperialists," The Nation, 100th Anniversary Issue, p. 79.

subordinate offices or as privates according to the relative energy which they may have exhibited in the development of the Jingo policy."

Of course, men who in high public position have held that patriotism should not be made subordinate to dollars and cents, and who have expressed such an earnest desire to assert and defend the honor of the country at any cost, would most enthusiastically vote for this enactment and would immediately enroll themselves for active service in the field.

If the Jingo spirit is deeply seated, the army thus recruited would be ample for the defense of the country; while on the other hand, if it is a merely superficial or skin disease of a slightly contagious kind, that fact would be proved by the lack of enrollment of gentlemen in the higher positions which would leave the Jingo army short of officers even if the number of privates should be sufficient to make two or three regiments out of our seventy million people. . . The place for the most effective service would be upon the disputed territory in South America lying between Guiana and Venezuela. A (Henry Cabot) Lodge might be found in some vast wilderness of the Orinoco, from which source the center of direction could be given to the Jingo army. Effective work would be found for young men of previous experience in the police departments of northern cities (Theodore Roosevelt) in the Provost Marshal department of the Jingo army. A place could also be found in the Courts Martial of the Jingo army for the Judges who fear that without an occasional war the young men of the North will be enervated and will become too much imbued with that Christian spirit which we have become so accustomed to consider as one making for peace, order and human welfare. . . This proposal for the immediate enrollment of the Jingo army will at once develop the sincerity of purpose of the advocates of aggression and violence by their enlistment. An indirect but great benefit would then ensue by the removal of these persons from the high positions in which they have proved their incapacity to deal with questions of peace, order and industry and to give them the opportunity to exert and prove their military prowess.⁹

Note has been taken of the swiftness with which US imperialism switched from the point of origin of the

9. Williamson, op. cit., pp. 215-16.

Spanish-American war in the Caribbean to the area of its real interest, the Far East. The presidential message calling for the war stated;

In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests which give us the right and duty to speak and to act, the war in Cuba must stop,

and maintained the theme that US interest was limited to preserving peace and ending the mutual slaughter between the government and the rebels through the salutary intervention of US troops. An indication of the direction of US intent was the recognition of Cuban independence and the repudiation of the republican government in whose name and under whose social program the Cuban guerrillas had been fighting.¹⁰ Although Cubans struggled and rebelled to regain a true independence without the humiliation of US interventions and US naval bases, it was only in 1959 that a beginning was made - and more than a beginning - to repay US imperialism for its crimes; but one portion of Cuban territory, Cuban independence, and Cuban honor remains unredeemed -- at Guantanamo Bay.

The establishment of US imperialism in the strategically crucial and raw materials-rich region of Southeast Asia surrounding the South China Sea reflected the increasing role of US imperialism in the exploitation of China. While the US supported Japan against Russia in the exploitation of north China, the US desired to act directly in competition with France and Britain in south China. From Hong Kong Britain dominated much of south China through privileges and concessions. Similarly, France's domination of Vietnam derived originally from the desire to have an area from which to threaten and exploit China, as in Britain's position at Hong Kong. When south Vietnam proved unsatisfactory for such a role against China, France asserted a "protectorate" over the Vietnamese government in the north. It then defeated a Chinese army which came to the aid of the Vietnamese, and from Vietnam the French extended their imperialism into south China bordering Vietnam and the Gulf of Tonkin. By conquering Manila the US hoped to use it to the same advantage as a base for exploitation of Southeast Asia and south China. (It has been suggested that the development of Philippine nationalism seeking the end of the US "protectorate",

10. Julius W. Pratt, A History of United States Foreign Policy (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955), pp. 374-81.

and the establishment of real Philippine independence, threatens the use of US strategic bases aimed at China located near Manila at Clark Field and Subic Bay. The result is the large-scale US troop and construction commitment at the strategic bases aimed at China on the coast of south Vietnam.)

The US domination of Manila, culminating in the surrender of the major forts at Corregidor and Cavite (May 2, 1898) "marks a turning point in the history of American territorial expansion. It marks as well the beginning of a protest movement of proportions, a movement led by a strangely assorted group of citizens who fought expansion tooth and nail, and, in the face of overwhelming odds, urged renunciation of the spoils of war".¹¹ The real meaning of the event was foreseen by such outstanding liberals as the President of Stanford University, David Starr Jordan, who told a San Francisco rally that same day that for the US to embark upon a policy of imperialism "our democracy must necessarily depart from its best principles and traditions. . . The basal principles of the Republic, a cooperative association in which 'all just government is derived from the consent of the governed.'"

The US seizure of Manila short-circuited the social revolution which had been developing in the Philippines. After years of executing rebelling intellectuals and priests, Spanish rule was challenged by a popular national liberation movement led by Emilio Aguinaldo. Upon US seizure of Manila Bay, the rebels proclaimed, on June 12, 1898, the independence of the Philippines under a provisional government with Aguinaldo as president, a proclamation later ratified by a constituent assembly. Three days after the declaration of Philippine independence a meeting to protest US imperialism and US aggression was held at Faneuil Hall in Boston. A Saratoga Conference on foreign policy in August, 1898, however, became an instrument of the government when the anti-imperialists yielded on principles to gain a broad coalition.

In America the outbreak of a war to be carried to the enemy and posing no danger to the homeland, did not silence but galvanized the war's opponents. Suddenly they became an entity with a name: the Anti-Imperialists. Professor Norton, now over 70, brought upon himself torrents of abuse and threats of violence to his house and person by urging his

11. Freidel & Pollack, op. cit., p. 359.

students not to enlist in a war in which "we jettison all that was most precious of our national cargo." Although an Irish politician of Boston proposed to send a lynching party for him and the press called him a "traitor". . . (a)t a meeting of the Congregational Church in Cambridge he spoke of how bitter it was that now, at the end of a century which had seen the greatest advance in knowledge and the hope of peace, America should be turning against her ideals and "plunging into an unrighteous war".¹²

The Bostonians, Gamaliel Bradford and Moorfield Storey, past president of the American Bar Association, founded the Committee of Correspondence to pursue the revolutionary purposes of thwarting US imperialism. Finally, to harness the leadership and popular support of the anti-imperialists, a large membership organization was formed. The Anti-Imperialist League was founded in the office of Edward Atkinson, and important league branches were founded in New York, Chicago and San Francisco.

The quest for power, money and glory abroad, the League maintained, would distract from reform at home and bring in its train a strong central government destructive of traditional states' rights and local liberties. Americans had enough to do to solve the problems of municipal corruption, war between capital and labor, disordered currency, unjust taxation, the use of public office for spoils, the rights of the colored people in the South and of the Indians in the West, before taking alien peoples under their rule. . . The Anti-Imperialists did not sweep up with them the Populists and followers of William Jennings Bryan and those soon to be known as Progressives. While these groups opposed standing armies, big navies and foreign entanglements and were in theory anti-imperialist, anti-militarist and anti-European, they were simultaneously imbued with a fever to fight Spain as a cruel European tyrant stamping out liberty at America's doorstep.¹³

The core of the Anti-Imperialist League was the Liberal Republicans or Mugwumps who supported sound money and free trade against the conservative Republicans' policies of inflation and protection of business. Carl Schurz, Charles Francis Adams, Edward Atkinson, Gamaliel Bradford, Moorfield Storey, E. L. God-

12. Tuchman, op. cit., p. 80.

13. Ibid., pp. 80-81.

kin, and Oswald Garrison Villard stood for the gold standard and free trade, peace and laissez-faire, good, but very little, government if at all. Their pre-Civil War no-government traditions were indicated by the inclusion of the "remnant of the old abolition groups, represented by the son of Garrison, the son of Emerson, the son of James Birney". Also identified with them were reformers and pacifists such as Jane Addams, George C. Mercer, who defended Indian rights, and Ernest Crosby, Charles B. Spahr and Edward Osgood Brown, all supporters of the single tax. The few businessmen, headed by Andrew Carnegie and Atkinson, provided the financing, while even fewer labor leaders were involved. But, intellectuals played a crucial role, whether as popular writers of fiction like Mark Twain or of social thought like Atkinson or college presidents and professors like David Starr Jordan of Stanford, William Graham Sumner of Yale, or Charles Eliot Norton and William James of Harvard.¹⁴

Richard Clark Sterne, "The Nation and its Century", in The Nation's 100th Anniversary Issue, notes how the crisis of US imperialism imposed a unity upon what had up to then appeared to be competing political philosophies, such as laissez-faire and Henry George's single tax concept.

But in The Nation of January 2, 1896, George is highly praised for organizing an anti-war demonstration at Cooper Union. The New York Tribune, The Nation angrily remarked, had given "mendacious reports" of the meeting magnifying the number of hecklers, but the occasion had been a success. George had made a "powerful and effective speech in the interest of peace and common sense."¹⁵

The paradox of the economically laissez-faire Nation joining hands with economic "radicals", because both the magazine and the radicals were opposed to colonialism, was illustrated on other occasions around the turn of the century. For example, in

-
14. The similarity between the present criminal aggression of the US government in Vietnam and that in the Philippines has led to the republication of the statements of leading opponents of the US government, such as Mark Twain's "To the person sitting in darkness", Viet-Report (January, 1966), pp. 25-29, and William James' support of the Philippine guerrillas against the US marines, The Progressive (January, 1966), p. 9.
 15. The Nation, op. cit., p. 252.

1896 The Nation noted that the Socialists in Germany had been directing their attacks more and more upon militarism, "which they characterize as the systematic fleecing of the workman in the interest of a soldier class". The magazine observed:

They are about right, . . . it is hardly too much to say that international socialism is at present about the most promising influence that is making for the disarmament of Europe.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that the journal which thus praises "international socialism" was anti-Marxist and laissez-faire. During the muck-racking years at the beginning of the twentieth century, the journal was to remain a most cautious critic, and always from a nineteenth century Liberal standpoint, of the "trusts". But. . . The Nation of that era was a friend of the anti-militaristic Socialists.¹⁶

The Spanish-American war ended effectively within six months of its beginning and was concluded within the year by the Treaty of Paris (December, 1898). Andrew Carnegie assumed the leadership of the lobby of the Anti-Imperialist League to defeat the treaty in the Senate. William Jennings Bryan, who had supported the imperialist war as did so many so-called progres-

16. Ibid., p. 260. However, the founders of the Nation considered, and used radical terms to describe, their laissez-faire principles as radical. "Olmsted tagged himself a "socialist democrat" and Godkin called himself a "radical", and they believed any government beyond the intimacy of the town meeting to be a tyranny." Robert Fridlington, "Frederick Law Olmsted: Launching The Nation", Nation (January 3, 1966), p. 12. A founder of the Nation, William Lloyd Garrison, his son, Wendell Phillips Garrison, and his grandson, Oswald Garrison Villard, both editors, were often considered anarchists. Villard sought confrontations with state power as much as Garrison did. "I suspect that one of his greatest disappointments was his discovery that the suspension of The Nation in September, 1918, was not in response to his article blasting the Justice Department for its violation of civil liberties, but for Albert Jay Nock's article characterizing Samuel Gompers as the administration's lackey, traveling in an "atmosphere of sheer bagmanism"." Michael Wreszin, "Oswald Garrison Villard, The Pacifist Rough Rider", Nation (June 21, 1965), p. 671.

sives, lobbied for the passage of treaty ratification so that "peace" could be made, the imperialist issues easily disposed of, and the political situation cleared for another presidential campaign centering on domestic issues. Despite Bryan, the anti-imperialists almost defeated the treaty. But, it was ratified in early February, 1899 by a single vote, with several Democratic and Populist senators voting for it on Bryan's recommendation. A resolution for Philippine independence was missed only by the tie-breaking vote of the Vice-President at the very moment that the Philippine national government of President Aguinaldo, realizing the totality of the American betrayal, attempted to resist the US occupation.

If The Nation was deeply depressed by our Cuban adventure, it was profoundly ashamed - along with Mark Twain and William James - of our treatment of the Filipinos. . . The United States cooperated with the Filipino patriot leader, Aguinaldo, in taking the islands from the Spaniards, and then American forces took the Philippines from the Filipinos. The official argument used to defend this procedure was that the mass of the natives desired American rule - was refuted by The Nation:

Whenever a small force of Americans undertakes an expedition, the woods and hills become alive with enemies.

Not bands of Filipino "robbers", The Nation continued, were using terrorist tactics; rather,

The American troops have done the terrorizing. Their conduct in some actions has been so ferocious, and their revenge in so many cases so terrible, as to make them dreaded and hated. The natives submit to the Americans because they are afraid of them. . .

30,000 Filipinos, the magazine estimated, had been killed by our forces.¹⁷

The Philippine resistance to the US aggression led to a complete identification with the cause of national liberation and opposition to the US government and its army by the anti-imperialists. The guerilla war against US imperialism led to a rapid growth of the anti-imperialist movement. By May, 1899 the original organization had thirty thousand members.

17. The Nation, op. cit., p. 256.

With the outbreak of the Philippine insurrection, in February, 1899, events in the islands came to play a much greater part in the productions of the anti-imperialists. . . . Particularly useful to the anti-imperialists were the reports of outrage committed by American troops during the insurrection - instances of the burning of crops and villages, disregard of the rules of civilized warfare, of the "water cure", and orders to "take no prisoners". Ironically enough, these were the sort of stories that had aroused the American nation against the Spaniards in Cuba. The anti-imperialists were quick to note this, and claim that it furnished a concrete example of the inevitable consequences of denying a people the fundamental right of self-government!¹⁸

Edward Atkinson assumed the forefront of the anti-imperialist publicity campaign.

In addition to being a vice-president of the Anti-Imperialist League, and contributing material for use by that organization, Mr. Atkinson printed and distributed his own series of pamphlets. . . . By some he was branded a traitor to his country, others praised his efforts as being highly patriotic and made substantial monetary contributions for the continuation of his work. Some of his former associates in the tariff and silver fights turned against him, while on the other hand, some of his strongest opponents found common ground with him on this issue.

In April, 1899, Mr. Atkinson conceived the idea of sending some of his pamphlets to some of the officers and soldiers stationed in the Philippines. He outlined his purpose (to the Secretary of the Treasury) on April 22. "In this morning's paper a correspondent of the Boston Herald states that the Departments are going to "expose" the Anti-Imperialist League and others who have as alleged stirred up discontent among the troops in Manila. I do not think the Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League has yet taken any active measures to inform the troops of the facts and conditions there. The suggestion is, however, a valuable one and I have sent to Washington today to get specific addresses of officers and soldiers to the number of five or six hundred so that I may send them my pamphlets, giving them assurance of sympathy. I shall place the same lists

18. Harrington, in Freidel and Pollack, op. cit., pp. 364-65.

in charge of the Executive Committee of the League to keep up the supply". Naturally, no such list of names was forthcoming.

Washington, May 2 (news dispatch). The Postmaster-General has directed the postmaster at San Francisco to take out of the mails for Manila three pamphlets issued by Edward Atkinson, of Boston, vice-president of the Anti-Imperialist League. This order does not apply to circulation of the pamphlets by mail in this country, but bars their dispatch from this country to the Philippines, discontent, and even mutiny, among the soldiers being stated by the department to be the design of these publications. The three pamphlets are specifically described, and in no circumstances are they to be forwarded by mail to the Philippines!¹⁹

The New England Anti-Imperialist League became skittish over Atkinson's exercise of freedom of speech between American citizens in disregard of the slavery of the US uniform. As a result he turned from the East Coast to the Mid-West as the focus of his pamphlet work and the Chicago Anti-Imperialist League became the major distributor of Atkinson's assaults upon the US government. Of the May 2 seizure and denial of free speech by the government post office, Atkinson drew on his forty years of acquaintance with Cabinet members and other high government officials in declaring:

I think the members of the Cabinet have graduated from an asylum for the imbecile and feeble-minded. They have evidently found out their blunder because the Administration papers suddenly ceased their attacks on me all on the same day, and I miss the free advertisement. I am now trying to stir them up again to provoke another attack.²⁰

-
19. Williamson, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-29. Atkinson's pamphlets included: "The Cost of a National Crime" (1898), 34 pp.; "The Hell of War and its Penalties" (1898), 23 pp.; and "Criminal Aggression; by Whom Committed?" (1899), 13 pp.
 20. *Ibid.*, pp. 229, 293-95. The New England Anti-Imperialist League again became the center of Atkinson's publication in 1902, especially his pamphlets on the cost of warfare of which five were issued until his death in 1905 soon after his participation in the 1905 International Peace Congress in Boston. *Ibid.*, p. 236.

On June 3, 1899, Atkinson began the publication of The Anti-Imperialist (of which six numbers were issued through October 1, 1900) and by September he was declaring his latest pamphlet "my strongest bid yet for a limited residence in Fort Warren". The distribution of about 135,000 copies of Atkinson's anti-imperialism pamphlets did not in the end result in Atkinson's imprisonment. But the fact that he and others had absolutely no respect for the processes of a government which had embarked upon an imperialist course created the conditions for a strong anti-imperialist and isolationist attitude among the American people, an attitude sufficient to blossom forth in crises two-thirds of a century later.

The American Anti-Imperialist League was founded as a protest against militarism and heavy taxes at home and aggression abroad; it held imperialism to be evil because of its denial of liberty and self-determination equally at home and abroad. The American Anti-Imperialist League held that if there was such a thing as treason, then it consisted of the support of imperialist actions of the US government and not opposition to them; it held that it was the US government that had introduced a civil war in American life, not those who opposed the betrayal of the fundamental ideals of the American people.

We earnestly condemn the policy of the present National Administration in the Philippines. It seeks to extinguish the spirit of 1776 in those islands. We deplore the sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors, whose bravery deserves admiration even in an unjust war. We denounce the slaughter of the Filipinos as a needless horror. . .

Imperialists assume that with the destruction of self-government in the Philippines by American hands, all opposition here will cease. This is a grievous error. Much as we abhor the war of "criminal aggression" in the Philippines, greatly as we regret that the blood of the Filipinos is on American hands, we more deeply resent the betrayal of American institutions at home. The real firing line is not in the suburbs of Manila. The foe is of our own household. . . Whether the ruthless slaughter of the Filipinos shall end next month or next year is but an incident in a contest that must go on until the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are rescued from the hands of their betrayers. Those who dispute about standards of value while the

Republic is undermined will be listened to as little as those who would wrangle about the small economies of the household while the household is on fire. The training of a great people for a century, the aspiration for liberty of a vast immigration are forces that will hurl aside those who in the delirium of conquest seek to destroy the character of our institutions. . .

We cordially invite the cooperation of all men and women who remain loyal to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.²¹

Louis Hartz has noted that an imperialist war, since it lacks any military danger to the imperialist country, permits freedom from hysteria and oppression that accompany a general war. An imperialist war may thus contain the conditions out of which a disinterested, uncompromising opposition can rally popular support. Imperialist wars, in contrast to general wars, are not fought against nations who share descendants with America, and therefore there is no clear-cut "fifth column" of Filipinos, Malays, Thais or Vietnamese, or Dominicans or Congolese for that matter, against whom a popularly supported witch-hunt can be directed. Thus, lacking the strong but compromised base of an ethno-centered and political opposition, anti-imperialist opposition can be generally American and moral. The shift in world politics changing US conflicts from inter-European to non-European creates totally new problems for the US government and important new opportunities for American anti-imperialists. Notwithstanding the imperialist messianism of racism, state-interest and chauvinism, imperialist wars fail to permit the ideological propaganda amidst the fears manufactured in a general war. Imperialist wars eliminate ideological debate between conflicting states, and open the most basic internal ideological debate, as Hans Morgenthau has perceptively noted.²² As Hartz describes it:

McKinley was involved in no ideological war unless it was a war within the United States. The Filipinos posed no threat to the American way of life, Agui-

21. Louis L. Snyder, ed., The Imperialism Reader (Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 391-93.
22. Louis Hartz, The Liberal Tradition in America (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1955), p. 288. Hans J. Morgenthau, "Where Consensus Breaks Down", New Republic (January 22, 1966), pp. 16-18.

naldo had no agents in Washington or San Francisco, and the current of moral passion, such as it was, came entirely from the American side. . . The Anti-Imperialist League, far from going underground, had branches openly in all parts of the country, enlisting the allegiance of many of the most prominent men in the country. . . And when the Secretary of War tried to stop Edward Atkinson from sending anti-imperialist propaganda to the soldiers who were actually fighting in the Philippines, a howl of protest went up which forced a withdrawal of the action and discredited the McKinley Administration. Atkinson, an outraged editorial writer said, was being victimized by a "rule of blood and iron".²³

Thus, as the case of Atkinson and the Anti-Imperialist League demonstrates, imperialist war provides a particularly fertile ground for a radical and widespread movement of opposition at home. A prolonged imperialist war, especially one leading to a defeat or stalemate for the imperialist power, is the most dangerous threat to its stability and its very continued existence.

A significant discussion of the role of the early Anti-Imperialists was held at the annual meeting April, 1962, of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and published in Studies on the Left (Vol. III, No. 1, 1962). Under the title "The Anti-Imperialists and Twentieth Century American Foreign Policy," the major paper was presented by John W. Rollins, and comments made by Harold Baron and Thomas J. McCormick.

Rollins properly noted that "the Great Debate over American imperialism that began in the 1890's has never ended." His major thesis holds that American liberal corporatists have attempted to reconcile the imperialism of US foreign policy--the negation of true liberalism--with the claims and rhetoric of liberalism. Hence, they have sought to portray imperialism not as the basic element of US history in the twentieth century but as a mere passing interlude. Thus, while they were dismissed as futile and irrelevant, the Anti-Imperialists emerged, in a sense, as the ideological victors. For imperialist liberal corporatism has been forced to speak as though anti-imperialist principles have formed the basis for American policies. Rollins, however, unfortunately leaps from the use of the Anti-Imperialist viewpoint as a mask for imperialism, to the conclusion that twentieth century imperialism really is the Anti-Imperialism of 1898-1900.

23. Hartz, op. cit., pp. 288, 292.

Baron perceptively pointed out that Rollins' error was caused by a confusion between the expansion of international trade without any support from government, with an expansion of territory or trade resting on government aid. As Baron declares: "all definitions of imperialism include as a central point the use of the power of the state. . . To him (Hobson) imperialism was the antithesis of free trade because it brought forth a neomercantilist policy on the part of the state in order to gain preferred positions in world markets. . . the doctrine of comparative advantage in international trade theory can hardly be classed as expansionism. The free trade concept of developing international trade had nothing in common with the neo-mercantilist governmental policy that prevailed in the United States."²⁴ Baron also recalled Lenin's comment in his Imperialism that the Anti-Imperialists in America were the "last of the Mohicans of bourgeois democracy," the last to resist the process by which monopoly and imperialism replaced the system of capitalist free competition.

McCormick also stressed the great differences between the current coercive system and the views of the laissez-faire Anti-Imperialists: "it would be fruitless to analyze the domestic scene in the twentieth century by equating 'corporatism' with laissez-faire. . . The primary role played by the State in contemporary expansionism, plus the accepted use of force--moral, economic, and military---to promote that expansion, make twentieth century American diplomacy a far different animal than the 'dead horse' of laissez-faire anti-imperialism."²⁵

24. Hans Baron, in Studies on the Left (Vol. III. No. 1, 1962), pp. 25-26.

25. Thomas J. McCormick, in ibid., p. 33.

Freedom To Travel

By RUSSELL D. STETLER, JR.*

The recent activities of the Passport Office of the State Department have recently made headlines in the press. Official maneuvers to restrict the passport of Professor Staughton Lynd have been matched by FBI demands that Professor H. Stuart Hughes be officially observed on his visits abroad. No friend of liberty can fail to abhor any interference with the freedom to travel, a freedom that has been one of the most basic liberties in American constitutional development. Long before the recognition of freedom of speech or assembly, the Magna Carta established the freedom to travel. Moreover, any attempt by the US government to interfere with free expression by Americans anywhere in the world by restricting their travel is a violation of the First Amendment by the Constitution. Senator George Malone (Rep., Nev.) expressed the libertarian view when, in 1957, he broke the State Department's travel ban by visiting a country on the Department's proscribed list: "It has always been my view that an American citizen could travel anywhere he liked." Or, as the Wall Street Journal declared editorially (June 18, 1958): "As for us, we don't like government by bureaucratic whim. We prefer government by law. . . We think American citizens who have broken no laws are as entitled to travel outside the 48 states as they are entitled to travel within them."



The freedom to travel no longer exists absolutely for citizens of the United States. The recent ruling

* Russell D. Stetler, Jr. is co-author with Bertrand Russell of War and Atrocity in Vietnam.

of the Supreme Court in the Zemel case has reaffirmed very serious limitations on the freedom of Americans to travel when and where they please. The high court has upheld the power of the State Department to invalidate passports for travel to certain nations at a time when we are legally at war with none of them and when de facto war exists between the United States and only one of these nations. It has not yet been decided by the Court whether it is constitutional to impose criminal sanctions on those who violate the travel ban. The long-delayed decision in United States v. Laub, Martinot, etc. will settle that question.

It would be misleading for us to suppose at the outset that the question we are considering ever receives the attention of anyone who has no prejudgments about the various extra-constitutional factors that impinge on the final decision. We are all well aware of the political and historical context in which these decisions have been and will be rendered. That the justices of the High Court are confessedly relying in their decisions on a number of dubious prejudgments about the internal nature and foreign policies of the various countries which Americans are not permitted to see with their own eyes, was brought home in the remarks of the Chief Justice in the Zemel case. According to the report of the New York Times of May 4, 1965:

"In the case of Cuba, Justice Warren said, the restrictions are justified because the Communist Government there seeks to export revolution through travelers."

I admit frankly that my own prejudices differ sharply from those of the court as expressed by the Chief Justice. I believe, for example, that "revolution" cannot be exported; instead, revolutions grow out of particular sets of conditions that make large numbers of people discontented with existing regimes and encourage them to develop and follow that ideology which will alter the conditions that breed dissatisfaction.

A more important point, however, is to show that the Court does not function outside the influence of certain hypotheses, and that these hypotheses and judgments outweigh other determinants in recent decisions limiting freedom to travel. I myself start with the assumption that holds quite simply that the freedom to travel ought not to be limited.

The Passport: Political or Functional

The basic restriction on travel from and returning to the United States involves the passport. It is important to note at the outset that the passport need not be per se a limitation on the freedom to travel. In fact, the original purpose of passports in the United States was merely to facilitate travel abroad. There was no prior assumption that the Government had to grant permission for travel. From the beginning, there were no official obstacles to travel. Only convicts and accused persons awaiting trial or on appeal were restricted.

Passports were issued not to authorize a right already enjoyed by most Americans but to certify that these individuals were citizens of the United States. Passports were to serve as a mere convenience to identify Americans to foreign principals. At first they were issued simultaneously by a variety of agencies, including the Secretary of State, other federal officials, state and local officials, and notaries public. In Urtetiqui v. D'Arcy, 34 U. S. (9 Pet.) 692 (1835), the Court noted that,

“ . . . there is no law of the United States in any manner regulating the issuing of passports, or directing upon what evidence it may be done, or declaring their legal effect.”

The fact that several different agencies employing diverse criteria had taken on the task of issuing passports created a number of obvious problems, not the least of which was that of forgery. It was thought to be in the general interest, then, to provide legislation to rectify these difficulties. In a circular of July 1845 the State Department declared:

“For the information of citizens of the United States about to visit foreign countries, where they may be subjected to inconvenience for the want of sufficient evidence of their national character, it is stated that passports will be granted gratis, by the Secretary of State, to such citizens, on his being satisfied that they are entitled to receive them.”¹

The precedent for this action had been established in

1. U. S. Department of State, The American Passport, by Gaillard Hunt (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898), p. 46.

wartime, particularly in the last days of the War of 1812. But in 1850 Congress first established its concern with the passport question by ratifying a treaty with Switzerland providing that the two nations would furnish passports to their nationals for travel to the other nation.

In 1856 Congress enacted a full-fledged passport statute, which stands today as our basic law on this subject. The Act of August 18, 1856 provided:

"That the Secretary of State shall be authorized to grant and issue passports, and cause passports to be granted, issued, and verified in foreign countries by such diplomatic or consular officers of United States, and under such rules as the President shall designate and prescribe for and on behalf of the United States, and no other person shall grant, issue, or verify any such passport; nor shall any passport be granted or issued to, or verified for, any other persons than citizens of the United States. . . ." ²

The Government has since argued that this statute is permissive, rather than mandatory. While conceding that the statute does not stipulate that a passport is required for egress or entry, many assert that the Secretary of State is not constrained by the Act to issue passports to any citizen. But this position seems to be opposed by the majority of earlier practitioners of the statute, such as Secretary of State Hamilton Fish (who spoke of the "right to be furnished with. . . evidence of citizenship"), Attorney-General Alphonso Taft, and the authors of the 1905 Rules Concerning the Granting and Issuing of Passports in the United States (who spoke of persons being "entitled to receive a passport").³ Thus, the historical development of the passport in the United States indicates that there was wide acceptance of the notion that all citizens had the right to be granted passports on request -- even though the passport was not at the time necessary to foreign travel.

Much of the controversy turns on the question of whether the passport is to be regarded as a political document or a functional instrument. In other words, we must examine the nature of the passport to de-

2. 11 Stat. 60 (1856).

3. Quoted in Leonard B. Boudin, "The Constitutional Right to Travel," Columbia Law Review, Vol. 56 (January 1956), p. 53, especially footnote 53.

termine whether it should be subject to the kinds of restrictions that have been imposed. The earliest legal statement on this question is to be found in a case cited above, Urtetiqui v. D'Arcy,⁴ Here the Court holds:

"It (the passport) is a document, which from its nature and object, is addressed to foreign powers; purporting only to be a request, that the bearer of it may pass safely and freely; and is to be considered rather in the character of a political document, by which the bearer is recognized, in foreign countries, as an American citizen; and which, by usage and the law of nations, is received as evidence of the fact." (My emphasis.)

Whether this case remains good law would seem to depend on the context in which this decision was written and whether the context has been substantially altered since then.

The Government holds that a passport is still a political document. It is partly on this basis that the Government argued in the Robeson, Nathan, Clark, and Kamen cases, holding that passports came within the foreign affairs function of the State Department. Ultimately, the decisions in these cases (including only the second of the two Robeson cases) failed to uphold the position of the Government.⁵

The difference in the positions of the courts in these cases and the earlier determination in Urtetiqui, is, as we have suggested above, due to a difference in context. The most important aspect of context is the change in the meaning and function of the passport over the years. In 1835, the passport was official identification, political in nature because it was a Government-issued certificate to foreign powers. The passport was not a necessary condition of travel at that time. Later, the passport became such a necessary condition. As a functional instrument to travel -- and thus a possible restriction on the freedom to travel -- it is hardly to be thought of as a "political" document. From the context of "convenience" to the context of "necessity" the passport moves to the status of an indispensable document which cannot any longer be termed merely "political".

Without a passport it becomes impossible to travel from the United States (and indeed for some time it

4. Urtetiqui v. D'Arcy, 34 U. S. (9 Pet.) 692 (1835).

5. See Boudin, op. cit., p. 51.

was also regarded as impossible to enter the country without a passport); this encroachment on the freedom to travel should never be further aggravated by political conditions, particularly when the term "political" is endowed with an unconstitutional vagueness.

Restrictions on Passports

Restrictions on freedom to travel were originally introduced as temporary war measures whenever the United States embarked on an interventionist or war-like foreign policy. During the War of 1812, travel was restricted in areas controlled by the enemy. Restrictions were again imposed during the Civil War. In 1918, during World War I, citizens of the United States were required to have a passport to enter or leave the country. This statute was terminated by an act of March 3, 1921; but, on June 21, 1941 the law was reenacted, giving the Executive the power to require passports whenever the President should declare a "national emergency". When the Japanese persisted in not accepting US dominance in Asia, President Roosevelt proclaimed a national emergency on November 14, 1941 -- three weeks before war was officially declared. After the war the restrictions were not strictly enforced. In 1952, however, they were replaced by the Walter-McCarran Act, which extended the 1918 and 1941 statutes into peacetime. Actually, the Walter-McCarran Act was passed and proclaimed (January 17, 1953) during the Korean "police action". And President Truman's declaration of national emergency during the Korean "police action" (December 16, 1950) has not yet been rescinded, even though over fifteen years have since elapsed. On top of the restrictions on Americans' freedom to travel to China, Korea, Vietnam, and Albania, President Kennedy added prohibition of travel to Cuba (January 19, 1961). Thus, the attacks on civil liberties that began during war emergencies have now become part of the permanent powers of government.

Once it was decided that the passport is a requirement for travel abroad, the State Department attempted to restrict freedom to travel according to its "discretion". Broadly speaking, there are two major categories of restriction on the freedom to travel imposed by the State Department. The first is an attempt to deny passports to particular individuals on the basis of a political test. The second is an attempt to deny all Americans access to particular foreign nations by refusing them valid passports for travel to these areas.

The State Department's initial attempt to deny passports on the basis of a political test occurred at the height of the McCarthy period. At that time, anyone who wished to travel abroad was required to sign an affidavit, swearing that he was not presently, nor had he ever been, a member of the Communist party or connected with a "Communist front" organization. Clearly the imposition of such a political test seriously threatens the liberties of all Americans; when the espousal of particular political beliefs and the active exercise of basic rights may be construed as a basis for confining an individual to this country, there is an important question of the vitality of the Constitution.

Moreover, the non-communist affidavit itself -- objectionable and vague as it was -- was but a necessary and not a sufficient condition for obtaining a passport. In other words, even if an individual signed the affidavit, he was not guaranteed to receive the passport since the State Department reserved the right to deny passports on accusations from certain undisclosed sources. Thus, Leonard Boudin, Clark Foreman, Corliss Lamont, Otto Nathan, Paul Robeson, and Max Schachtman sued the State Department during the nineteen fifties on the ground that "undisclosed" accusations constituted a denial of certain Fifth Amendment rights. The courts sided with the plaintiffs and demanded that hearings be held in accord with due process before the State Department could deny passports.

The constitutionality of the affidavit itself was later called into question by Dr. Walter Brieuhl and the artist Rockwell Kent. In Kent v. Dulles, 357 U. S. 116 (1958), the Supreme Court held that the Secretary of State had not been authorized to exercise such broad "discretionary" powers as he had exercised in requiring the non-communist affidavit. In addition to this narrowly legalistic decision, the court added that even if he had been properly authorized by an act of Congress it "would be faced with important constitutional questions".

In the second category of encroachments on the freedom to travel is the so-called "travel ban". In addition to the passport's being generally necessary for travel abroad, it must also be "valid" for travel to those countries that one may wish to visit. Thus, Dr. Waldo Frank, in possession of a "valid passport" (i.e., a passport that had not expired), was unable to accept an invitation to lecture on Walt Whitman at the University of Peking because his passport was not spec-

ially "validated" for travel in China. This dual validity -- general and special -- seems in itself to be a problem meriting judicial attention. But the Supreme Court refused to review the Frank case.⁶

The already ambiguous concept of validity becomes incomprehensible in any further consideration of the travel ban. Whenever particular individuals have violated the travel ban, their penalty has been confiscation of passport. Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, for example, traveled to China in 1956. When he returned to the United States, his passport was removed. Furthermore, when he promised not to violate the travel ban in the future, his passport was returned. Scrutinizing the various changes that occur in this process, we find that Dr. DuBois left the United States with the necessary condition (a valid passport). However, his passport was not sufficiently valid to cover his eventual trip to China. Moreover, he returned to the United States with the necessary condition (a valid passport). His passport was then rendered absolutely invalid; then, on his promise not to visit any proscribed country in the future, his passport was restored to him. It is extremely difficult to find any consistency or logic in the actions of the Government in this entire matter.

The case of William Worthy is slightly more consistent. Mr. Worthy, a well-known Negro journalist of the Baltimore Afro-American, traveled to China and lost his passport as a result. His was never returned, and subsequent excursions by Worthy resulted in his ultimately being indicted for entering the country without a valid passport. Worthy's conviction was reversed by the Fifth Circuit Federal Court of Appeals (which also stated explicitly that it would have upheld a conviction for leaving the country without a valid passport, had that been the issue). Once again, it is difficult to discern the logic of the courts.

Most recently, the Court has denied Louis Zemel's petition to obtain a passport that would be valid for travel to Cuba. The explanation given by the Court on this matter merits some consideration; the New York Times of 4 May 1965 reports:

In affirming that decision today, by a vote of 6 to 3, the Supreme Court distinguished the situation

6. See Philip Abbott Luce, "The Freedom to Travel: A Study", Rights (November-December 1963), p. 16.

from earlier cases in which it had invalidated efforts of the Secretary of State to deny passports on the ground of political belief or association.

...
In the Court's ruling today, Chief Justice Earl Warren said that the area restriction is different from those (Kent, etc.) cases because it was based on "foreign policy considerations affecting all citizens," and was not used to penalize individuals for their beliefs.

He said that the fact that a liberty cannot be inhibited without due process of law does not mean that it can under no circumstances be inhibited.

It would seem to be unnecessary to mention that the Constitution does not speak explicitly of passports and the freedom to travel. But the confusion on this matter constrains us to state the obvious; the State Department's authority on the passport question does not stem from the Constitution itself. Phrases like "foreign policy considerations affecting all citizens" must not be used to cloud this issue; the simple fact is that whatever powers the State Department has in this regard are bestowed on it by Congress,

The Act of August 18, 1856, which made the issuance of passports the unique prerogative of the State Department, was modified by the Act of July 3, 1926, which states:

"The Secretary of State may grant and issue passports. . . under such rules as the President shall designate and prescribe for and on behalf of the United States, and no other person shall grant, issue, or verify such passports." ⁷

There is one important alteration in the wording of the statute. The earlier version contained the phrase 'shall be authorized to' rather than the word 'may'. This construction does not, of course, alter the fact that this law of Congress is authorizing the Secretary of State to perform the particular tasks designated. It has been used, however, to suggest that the Secretary of State is not obligated to issue passports. We need only note that at the time this statute was passed Congress did not contemplate making the passport a necessary condition for travel.

7. Title 22, United States Code, Section 211 (a).

It is quite clear that whatever "discretionary" powers may be said to derive from this statute are procedural, and not substantive. This contention is in fact supported by the Executive Order that provides the firmest basis for the Government's contention that discretionary powers exist. Executive Order No. 7856, March 31, 1938, states:

The Secretary of State is authorized in his discretion to refuse to issue a passport, to restrict the passport for use only in certain countries, to withdraw or cancel a passport already issued, and to withdraw a passport for the purpose of restricting its validity or use in certain countries.⁸

The Secretary of State is authorized to make regulations on the subject of issuing, renewing, extending, amending, restricting, or withdrawing passports additional to the rules in this part and not inconsistent therewith.⁹

Once again, it is to be noted that this proclamation is made in reference to the 1926 statute which did not contemplate making passports a condition for travel.

In any case, the Executive Order stipulates that whatever rules the Secretary of State shall make must not be inconsistent with already existing provisions. Additionally, it in no way suggests that the "discretion" of the Secretary of State could be used to deny someone the right to travel -- except to certain proscribed regions. Moreover, the only basis for denial of passport must conform substantively to previous directions; namely, that citizenship and absence of criminal indictments be the sole criteria for granting passports.

The passport did not become a necessary condition for entry and exit until 1952, with certain wartime exceptions. The Act of June 27, 1952 states that, after a proscribed proclamation by the President, it is "unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter, or attempt to depart from or enter, the United States, unless he bears a valid passport."¹⁰ A similar provision had existed for wartime and had been extended in 1941 to include states of emergency.

In 1947 the Passport Division initiated the procedure of employing political tests as criteria for issuance

8. Title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 51.75.

9. Title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 51.77.

10. Title 8, United States Code, Section 1185.

of passports. This new procedure came at a time of so-called emergency in which the passport was already necessary for travel abroad. Leonard Boudin sums up the event thus:

"Suffice it to say that without statutory support, an executive order, or even its own formal regulations, the Passport Division (now called the Passport Office) added its own political criteria to the list of qualifications requisite for passport issuance. Individuals of widely contrasting views were told, without benefit of charges, hearing, or evidence, that their travel would not be 'in the best interests of the United States.'" ¹¹

Two cases tested the State Department's unprecedented action. The first was brought by Paul Robeson to return his passport, which had been invalidated by the State Department. His case presented broad issues, and the courts dodged them. It was dismissed on various technicalities, such as jurisdiction and the contention that the passage of time would have caused the passport to expire anyway, thus mooting the matter at hand after that amount of time. A more limited attack came in Bauer v. Acheson, in which the appellant conceded that the Secretary of State had certain discretionary powers but contended that these powers had been abused by an arbitrary exercise of them. A three-judge statutory court decided in favor of that contention.

Relying on the court's recognition of its nebulous discretionary powers -- provided they not be used arbitrarily -- the State Department soon formalized its regulations. On August 28, 1952 regulations were instituted which deny passports to persons associated in one way or another with "the Communist movement". Membership in the Communist party is only one type of damning connection; persons otherwise under the "control" of the Communist movement are prevented from obtaining passports.

The reaction of the courts to these attempts by the State Department to limit the freedom to travel of political dissidents has been described earlier. At this point, we have only to add the comments of the court in regard to discretionary power in the Kent case:

"Since we start with an exercise by an American citizen of an activity included in constitutional pro-

11. Boudin, op. cit., p. 60.

tection, we will not readily infer that Congress gave the Secretary of State unbridled discretion to grant or withhold it. If we were dealing with political questions entrusted to the Chief Executive by the Constitution we would have a different case. But there is more involved here. In part, of course, the issuance of the passport carries some implication of intention to extend the bearer diplomatic protection, though it does not more than 'request all whom it may concern to permit safely and freely to pass, and in case of need to give all lawful aid and protection' to this citizen of the United States. But that function of the passport is subordinate. Its critical function today is control over exit. And, as we have seen, the right of exit is a personal right included within the word 'liberty' as used in the Fifth Amendment. If that 'liberty' is to be regulated, it must be pursuant to the lawmaking functions of the Congress. . . And if that power is delegated, the standards must be adequate to pass scrutiny by the accepted tests. . . Where activities or enjoyment, natural and often necessary to the well-being of an American citizen, such as travel, are involved, we will construe narrowly all delegated powers that curtail or dilute them. . . We hesitate to find in this broad generalized power an authority to trench so heavily on the rights of the citizen."¹²

Thus, Mr. Kent has scored a Pyrrhic victory. He has won his case, but much has been lost to the State Department. The abuses of Mrs. Ruth Shipley (head of the Passport Office during the height of the McCarthy period) are terminated, without abolishing or even challenging the original basis of that power which she so clearly abused.

Conclusions

"The right to travel is a part of the 'liberty' of which the citizen cannot be deprived without the due process of law of the Fifth Amendment. So much is conceded by the Solicitor General. In Anglo-Saxon law that right was emerging at least as early as the Magna Carta. Chafee, Three Human Rights in the Constitution (1956), 171-181, 187 et. seq., shows how deeply engrained in our history this freedom of movement is. Freedom of movement across frontiers in either direction, and inside frontiers as well, was part of our heritage. Travel

12. Kent v. Dulles, 357 U. S. 116 (1958).

abroad, like travel within the country, may be necessary for a livelihood. It may be as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, wears, or reads. Freedom of movement is basic in our scheme of values. . . 'Our nation,' wrote Chafee, 'has thrived on the principle that, outside areas of plainly harmful conduct, every American is left to shape his own life as he thinks best, do what he pleases, go where he pleases.' Id., at 197.

"Freedom of movement also has large social values. As Chafee put it,

Foreign correspondents and lecturers on public affairs need first-hand information. Scientists and scholars gain greatly from consultations with colleagues in other countries. Students equip themselves for more fruitful careers in the United States by instruction in foreign universities. Then there are reasons close to the core of personal life -- marriage, reuniting families, spending hours with old friends. Finally, travel abroad enables American citizens to understand that people like themselves live in Europe and helps them to be well-informed on public issues. . .¹³

The Supreme Court has spoken eloquently and clearly on the value of freedom to travel. It has regarded it as a precious liberty, already enshrined in the glorious tradition dating from the Magna Carta. The right to travel has been viewed as basic to the preservation of democracy. But the courts have also shown their willingness to set aside such statements in order to preserve a less glorious tradition, that of Cold War American diplomacy.

It appears that the Supreme Court is unwilling to assert libertarian doctrine in an anti-libertarian climate. The courts explicitly (Zemel) or implicitly (Worthy) accept the hypothesis that there is an imminent danger to our liberties from an international communist movement aiming to conquer the world. The alleged external danger is introduced as a balancing factor against our basic liberties. Even when this balancing test is not explicitly acknowledged, its presence may be discerned in the attitude of the court. For example, the New York Times of May 4, 1965 reported Earl Warren's off-the-record remarks thus:

13. Kent v. Dulles, 357 U. S. 116 (1958).

In delivering his opinion from the bench he ad libbed that such restrictions were needed "in these turbulent times when explosion after explosion occur in the world".

The unacknowledged balancing test is also to be read between the lines in the Worthy opinion. The Appeals Court found banishment to be unconstitutional (in effect voiding one half of the provision of the Walter-McCar-ran Act of 1952, which requires passports for entry to and exit from the United States in time of war or national emergency). But it balanced this libertarian contention by offering an obiter dictum that upheld the provision for prosecution for leaving the country without a valid passport. The Court's argument in this latter case is an interesting example of its ability to disregard its own professions about "freedom" and "basic values". After quoting from the Kent decision in regard to the necessity of freedom to travel, the Court states:

A citizen (intending to leave the United States) at an airport or pier without a passport, can refrain from a violation of the statute (1185) by remaining in the country. So doing, he can continue to exercise all the rights and privileges of a citizen.¹⁴

What the court seems to be averring is that (1) all Americans have the right to travel, (2) traveling without a passport is a crime, (3) a failure to exercise the right to travel is a means of avoiding criminal prosecution for exercising the right to travel, (4) a failure to exercise the right to travel allows the possibility of exercising "all the rights and privileges of a citizen". This last proposition seems to be inherently contradictory. It seems to embody the position that the freedom to travel means the "freedom to travel with a passport" or the "freedom not to travel without a passport".

Such specious arguing hardly results from a logical attempt to examine statutes and regulations abstractly. The confusion derives from an attempt to balance reason and unreason, liberty and alleged dangers, constitutional principles and Cold War hysteria.

14. Quoted in Levi Lee Laub, "Recent Decisions on Travel," Rights (April-May-June 1964), p. 18.

The same attempts at balance are to be found in Zemel. This time the court has supported the Government's position; but it leaves open the possibility that in the future it will once again respect certain basic liberties by refusing at this time to make advisory statements on the application of criminal sanctions for violation of the travel ban.

The question of punishment for traveling to Cuba may be settled in the case of Helen Travis, whose conviction by the Federal District Court of California has been upheld on appeal. Miss Travis traveled to Cuba without a "valid" passport; the prosecution is based on the Immigration Act of 1952. The whole matter will be settled finally in the cases involving the students who organized and led student trips to Cuba in the summers of 1963 and 1964. The representatives of the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba who are under indictment are charged with entering and leaving the country without valid passports (a violation of the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act of 1952) and with "conspiring" to commit a crime (i.e., to travel to Cuba).

These cases provide a supreme test of the Court's position: does its acceptance of a "Red menace" overbalance its belief that criminal sanctions ought not to be imposed on those who exercise what have been considered to be basic and elementary rights?

The Supreme Court's role at this time is cautious. It advocates liberties on rare occasions, while opting for procedural due process with good consistency. But nearly always there is evidence for believing that the Court is fearful of opposing not the "paramount interest" of the nation, but the orthodox madness of Cold War policy. The nation fears, and the Court will not show courage. Our liberties are in our own hands.

On Moral Education

By HERBERT SPENCER

Education is a perennially important and controversial subject, especially in a country as child-centered as the United States. Within libertarian ranks, an unlimited diversity of viewpoint prevails, ranging from rigorous traditionalists to ultra-progressives. Among the numerous libertarians in the Los Angeles area, a controversy is now raging between the Cardin and Montessori methods of education. We believe that the views of Herbert Spencer, the great 19th century English social philosopher, can provide a much-needed but totally neglected contribution toward a rational solution to many of these disputes, a solution grounded on education in cause-and-effect. The following article is condensed from the chapter on "Moral Education" in Herbert Spencer's Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical (A. L. Burt Company, n.d.).



While it is seen that for the purpose of gaining a livelihood, an elaborate preparation is needed, it appears to be thought that for the bringing up of children, no preparation whatever is needed. In the absence of this preparation, the management of children, and more especially the moral management, is lamentably bad. Parents either never think about the matter at all, or else their conclusions are crude, and inconsistent. In most cases, and especially on the part of mothers, the treatment adopted on every occasion is that which the impulse of the moment prompts: it springs not from

any reasoned-out conviction as to what will most conduce to the child's welfare, but merely expresses the passing parental feelings, whether good or ill; and varies from hour to hour as these feelings vary. Or if these blind dictates of passion are supplemented by any definite doctrines and methods, they are those that have been handed down from the past, or those suggested by the remembrances of childhood, or those adopted from nurses and servants--methods devised not by the enlightenment, but by the ignorance of the time.

Let us go on to consider the true aims and methods of moral education. When a child falls or runs its head against the table, it suffers a pain, the remembrance of which tends to make it more careful for the future; and by an occasional repetition of like experiences, it is eventually disciplined into a proper guidance of its movements. If it lays hold of the fire-bars, thrusts its finger into the candle-flame, or spills boiling water on any part of its skin, the resulting burn or scald is a lesson not easily forgotten.

Now in these and like cases, Nature illustrates to us in the simplest way, the true theory and practice of moral discipline. Observe, in the first place, that in bodily injuries and their penalties we have misconduct and its consequences reduced to their simplest forms. Though according to their popular acceptations, right and wrong are words scarcely applicable to actions that have none but direct bodily effects; yet whoever considers the matter will see that such actions must be as much classifiable under these heads as any other actions. Note, in the second place, the character of the punishments by which these physical transgressions are prevented. Punishments, we call them, in the absence of a better word; for they are not punishments in the literal sense. They are not artificial and unnecessary inflictions of pain; but are simply the beneficent checks to actions that are essentially at variance with bodily welfare--checks in the absence of which life would quickly be destroyed by bodily injuries. It is the peculiarity of these penalties, if we must so call them, that they are nothing more than the unavoidable consequences of the deeds which they follow; they are nothing more than the inevitable reactions entailed by the child's actions.

Let it be further borne in mind that these painful reactions are proportionate to the degree in which the organic laws have been transgressed. A slight accident brings a slight pain, a more serious one, a greater

pain. When a child tumbles over the doorstep, it is not ordained that it shall suffer in excess of the amount necessary, with the view of making it still more cautious than the necessary suffering will make it. But from its daily experience it is left to learn the greater or less penalties of greater or less errors, and to behave accordingly. And then mark, lastly, that these natural reactions which follow the child's wrong actions, are constant, direct, unhesitating, and not to be escaped. No threats; but a silent, rigorous performance.

Still more significant will these general truths appear, when we remember that they hold throughout adult life as well as throughout infantine life. It is by an experimentally-gained knowledge of the natural consequences, that men and women are checked when they go wrong. After home education has ceased, and when there are no longer parents and teachers to forbid this or that kind of conduct, there comes into play a discipline like that by which the young child is taught its first lessons in self-guidance. If the youth entering upon the business of life idles away his time and fulfills slowly or unskillfully the duties entrusted to him, there by and by follows the natural penalty; he is discharged, and left to suffer for awhile the evils of relative poverty. On the unpunctual man, failing alike his appointments of business and pleasure, there continually fall the consequent inconveniences, losses, and deprivations. The avaricious tradesman who charges too high a rate of profit, loses his customers, and so is checked in his greediness. And so throughout the life of every citizen. In the quotation so often made a propos of these cases--"The burnt child dreads the fire"--we see not only that the analogy between this social discipline and Nature's early discipline of infants is universally recognized; but we also see an implied conviction that this discipline is of the most efficient kind.

Have we not here, then, the guiding principle of moral education? Must we not infer that the system so beneficent in its effects, alike during infancy and maturity, will be equally beneficent throughout youth? Is it not manifest that as "ministers and interpreters of Nature" it is the function of parents to see that their children habitually experience the true consequences of their conduct--the natural reactions: neither warding them off, nor intensifying them, nor putting artificial consequences in place of them?

Probably, however, not a few will contend that already most parents do this--that the punishments they inflict

are, in the majority of cases, the true consequences of ill-conduct--that parental anger, venting itself in harsh words and deeds, is the result of a child's transgression. But observe that the discipline on which we are insisting is not so much the experience of parental approbation, or disapprobation, which, in most cases, is only a secondary consequence of a child's conduct; but it is the experience of those results which would naturally flow from the conduct in the absence of parental opinion or interference. The truly instructive and salutary consequences are not those inflicted by parents when they take upon themselves to be Nature's proxies; but they are those inflicted by Nature herself. We will endeavor to make this distinction clear by a few illustrations, which, while they show what we mean by natural reactions as contrasted with artificial ones, will afford some directly practical suggestions.

In every family where there are young children there almost daily occur cases of what mothers and servants call "making a litter". A child has had out its box of toys, and leaves them scattered about the floor. In most cases the trouble of rectifying this disorder falls anywhere but in the right place; if in the nursery, the nurse herself, with many grumblings undertakes the task; if below stairs, the task usually devolves either on one of the elder children or on the house-maid; the transgressor being visited with nothing more than a scolding. In this very simple case, however, there are many parents wise enough to follow out, more or less consistently, the normal course--that of making the child itself collect the toys or shreds. The labor of putting things in order is the true consequence of having put them in disorder. Every trader in his office, every wife in her household, has daily experience of this fact. And if education be a preparation for the business of life, then every child should also, from the beginning, have daily experience of this fact. If the natural penalty be met by any refractory behavior, then the proper course is to let the child feel the ulterior reaction consequent on its disobedience. Having refused or neglected to pick up and put away the things it has scattered about, and having thereby entailed the trouble of doing this on someone else, the child should, on subsequent occasions, be denied the means of giving this trouble. When next it petitions for its toy-box, the reply of its mamma should be--"The last time you had your toys you left them lying on the floor, and Jane had to pick them up. So that, as you will not put away your toys when you have done with them, I cannot let you have them." This is obviously a natural consequence, neither increased nor lessened; and must be so recog-

nized by a child. The penalty comes, too, at the moment when it is most keenly felt. A new-born desire is balked at the moment of anticipated gratification; and the strong impression so produced can scarcely fail to have an effect on the future conduct. Add to which, that, by this method, a child is early taught the lesson which cannot be learned too soon, that in this world of ours pleasures are rightly to be obtained only by labor.

Take another case. Not long since we had frequently to listen to the reprimands visited on a little girl who was scarcely ever ready in time for the daily walk. Of eager disposition, and apt to become thoroughly absorbed in the occupation of the moment, Constance never thought of putting on her things until the rest were ready. The governess and the other children had almost invariably to wait; and from the mamma there almost invariably came the same scolding. Utterly as this system failed it never occurred to the mamma to let Constance experience the natural penalty. Nor, indeed, would she try it when it was suggested to her. In the world the penalty of being behind time is the loss of some advantage that would else have been gained: the train is gone; or the steamboat is just leaving its moorings. And every one, in cases perpetually occurring, may see that it is the prospective deprivations entailed by being too late which prevent people from being too late. Is not the inference obvious? Should not these prospective deprivations control the child's conduct also? If Constance is not ready at the appointed time, the natural result is that of being left behind, and losing her walk. And no one can doubt that after having once or twice remained at home while the rest were enjoying themselves in the fields, and after having felt that this loss of a much-prized gratification was solely due to want of promptitude, some amendment would take place. At any rate, the measure would be more effective than that perpetual scolding which ends only in producing callousness.

Again, when children, with more than usual carelessness, break or lose the things given to them, the natural penalty--the penalty which makes grown-up persons more careful--is the consequent inconvenience. The want of the lost or damaged article, and the cost of supplying its place, are the experiences by which men and women are disciplined in these matters; and the experience of children should be as much as possible assimilated to theirs. We do not refer to that early period at which toys are pulled to pieces in the process of learning their physical properties, and at which the results of

carelessness cannot be understood; but to a later period, when the meaning and advantages of property are perceived. When a boy, old enough to possess a penknife, uses it so roughly as to snap the blade, a thoughtless parent, or some indulgent relative, will commonly forthwith buy him another; not seeing that, by doing this, a valuable lesson is lost. In such a case, a father may properly explain that penknives cost money, and that to get money requires labor; that he cannot afford to purchase new penknives for one who loses or breaks them; and that until he sees evidence of greater carefulness he must decline to make good the loss. A parallel discipline may be used as a means of checking extravagance.

These few familiar instances, here chosen because of the simplicity with which they illustrate our point, will make clear to everyone the distinction between those natural penalties which we contend are the truly efficient ones, and those artificial penalties which parents commonly substitute for them. Let us note the many and great superiorities of this principle over the principle, or rather the empirical practice, which prevails in most families.

In the first place, right conceptions of cause and effect are early formed; and by frequent and consistent experience are eventually rendered definite and complete. Proper conduct in life is much better guaranteed when the good and evil consequences of actions are rationally understood, than when they are merely believed on authority. A child who finds that disorderliness entails the subsequent trouble of putting things in order, or who misses a gratification from dilatoriness, or whose want of care is followed by the loss or breakage of some much-prized possession, not only experiences a keenly-felt consequence, but gains a knowledge of causation; both the one and the other being just like those which adult life will bring. Whereas a child who in such cases receives some reprimand or some factitious penalty, not only experiences a consequence for which it often cares very little, but lacks that instruction respecting the essential natures of good and evil conduct, which it would else have gathered. It is a vice of the common system of artificial rewards and punishments, that by substituting for the natural results of misbehavior certain threatened tasks or castigations, it produces a radically wrong standard of moral guidance. Having throughout infancy and boyhood always regarded parental or tutorial displeasure as the result of a forbidden action, the youth has gained an established association of ideas between such action

and such displeasure, as cause and effect; and consequently when parents and tutors have abdicated, and their displeasure is not to be feared, the restraint on a forbidden action is in great measure removed; the true restraints, the natural reactions, having yet to be learned by sad experience. As writes one who has had personal knowledge of this short-sighted system: "Young men let loose from school plunge into every description of extravagance; they know no rule of action--they are ignorant of the reasons for moral conduct--they have no foundation to rest upon."

Another great advantage of this natural system of discipline is, that it is a system of pure justice; and will be recognized by every child as such. Whoso suffers nothing more than the evil which obviously follows naturally from his own misbehavior, is much less likely to think himself wrongly treated than if he suffers an evil artificially inflicted on him; and this will be true of children as of men. Take the case of a boy who is habitually reckless of his clothes, scrambles through hedges without caution, or is utterly regardless of mud. If he is beaten, or sent to bed, he is apt to regard himself as ill-used; and his mind is more likely to be occupied by thinking over his injuries than repenting of his transgressions. But suppose he is required to rectify as far as he can the harm he has done--to clean off the mud with which he has covered himself, or to mend the tear as well as he can. Will he not feel that the evil is one of his own producing? Will he not while paying this penalty be continuously conscious of the connection between it and its cause? And will he not, spite his irritation, recognize more or less clearly the justice of the arrangement?

Again, the tempers both of parents and children are much less liable to be ruffled under this system than under the ordinary system. Instead of letting children experience the painful results which naturally follow from wrong conduct, the usual course pursued by parents is to inflict themselves certain other painful results. A double mischief arises from this. Making, as they do, multiplied family laws; and identifying their own supremacy and dignity with the maintenance of these laws; it happens that every transgression comes to be regarded as an offense against themselves, and a cause of anger on their part. Add to which the further irritations which result from taking upon themselves, in the shape of extra labor or cost, those evil consequences which should have been allowed to fall on wrong-doers. Similarly with the children. Penalties which the necessary reaction of things brings round

upon them--penalties which are inflicted by an impersonal agency, produce an irritation that is comparatively slight and transient; whereas, penalties which are voluntarily inflicted by a parent, and are afterward remembered as caused by him or her, produce an irritation both greater and more continued.

Just consider how disastrous would be the result if this empirical method were pursued from the beginning. Suppose it were possible for parents to take upon themselves the physical sufferings entailed on their children by ignorance and awkwardness; and that while bearing these evil consequences they visited on their children certain other evil consequences, with the view of teaching them the impropriety of their conduct. Suppose that when a child, who had been forbidden to meddle with the kettle, spilt some boiling water on its foot, the mother vicariously assumed the scald and gave a blow in place of it; and similarly in all other cases. Would not the daily mishaps be sources of far more anger than now? Would not there be chronic ill-temper on both sides? Yet an exactly parallel policy is pursued in after years. A father who punishes his boy for carelessly or wilfully breaking a sister's toy, and then himself pays for a new toy, does substantially this same thing--inflicts an artificial penalty on the transgressor, and takes the natural penalty on himself: his own feelings and those of the transgressor being alike needlessly irritated. If he simply required restitution to be made, he would produce far less heart-burning. If he told the boy that a new toy must be bought at his, the boy's cost, and that his supply of pocket-money must be withheld to the needful extent, there would be much less cause for ebullition of temper on either side; while in the deprivation afterward felt, the boy would experience the equitable and salutary consequence. In brief, the system of discipline by natural reactions is less injurious to temper, alike because it is perceived on both sides to be nothing more than pure justice, and because it more or less substitutes the impersonal agency of nature for the personal agency of parents.

At present, mothers and fathers are mostly considered by their offspring as friend-enemies. Determined as their impressions inevitably are by the treatment they receive; and oscillating as that treatment does between bribery and thwarting, between petting and scolding, between gentleness and castigation; children necessarily acquire conflicting beliefs respecting the parental character. A mother commonly thinks it quite sufficient to tell her little boy that she is his best friend;

and assuming that he is in duty bound to believe her, concludes that he will forthwith do so. "It is all for your good"; "I know what is proper for you better than you do yourself"; "You are not old enough to understand it now, but when you grow up you will thank me for doing what I do";--these and like assertions, are daily reiterated. Meanwhile the boy is daily suffering positive penalties; and is hourly forbidden to do this, that, and the other, which he was anxious to do. By words he hears that his happiness is the end in view; but from the accompanying deeds he habitually receives more or less pain. Utterly incompetent as he is to understand that future which his mother has in view, or how this treatment conduces to the happiness of that future, he judges by such results as he feels; and finding these results anything but pleasurable, he becomes skeptical respecting these professions of friendship. And is it not folly to expect any other issue? Must not the child judge by such evidence as he has got? And does not this evidence seem to warrant his conclusion? The mother would reason in just the same way if similarly placed. If, in the circle of her acquaintances, she found someone who was constantly thwarting her wishes, uttering sharp reprimands, and occasionally inflicting actual penalties on her, she would pay but little attention to any professions of anxiety for her welfare which accompanied these acts. Why, then, does she suppose that her boy will conclude otherwise?

But now observe how different will be the results if the system we contend for be consistently pursued--if the mother not only avoids becoming the instrument of punishment, but plays the part of a friend, by warning her boy of the punishments which Nature will inflict. Take a case; and that it may illustrate the mode in which this policy is to be early initiated, let it be one of the simplest cases. Suppose that, prompted by the experimental spirit so conspicuous in children, whose proceedings instinctively conform to the inductive method of inquiry--suppose that so prompted the child is amusing himself by lighting pieces of paper in the candle and watching them burn. If his mother is of the ordinary unreflective stamp, she will either, on the plea of keeping the child "out of mischief", or from fear that he will burn himself, command him to desist; and in case of non-compliance will snatch the paper from him. On the other hand, should he be so fortunate as to have a mother of sufficient rationality, who knows that this interest with which the child is watching the paper burn results from a healthy inquisitiveness, without which he would never have emerged

out of infantine stupidity, and who is also wise enough to consider the moral results of interference, she will reason thus: "If I put a stop to this I shall prevent the acquirement of a certain amount of knowledge. It is true that I may save the child from a burn; but what then? He is sure to burn himself sometime; and it is quite essential to his safety in life that he should learn by experience the properties of flame. Moreover, if I forbid him from running this present risk, he is sure hereafter to run the same or a greater risk when no one is present to prevent him; whereas, if he should have any accident now that I am by, I can save him from any great injury; add to which the advantage that he will have in future some dread of fire, and will be less likely to burn himself to death, or set the house in a flame when others are absent. Furthermore, were I to make him desist, I should thwart him in the pursuit of what is in itself a purely harmless, and indeed, instructive gratification; and he would be sure to regard me with more or less ill-feeling. Ignorant as he is of the pain from which I would save him, and feeling only the pain of a balked desire, he could not fail to look upon me as the cause of that pain. To save him from a hurt which he cannot conceive, and which has therefore no existence for him, I inflict upon him a hurt which he feels keenly enough; and so become, from his point of view, a minister of evil. My best course then, is simply to warn him of the danger, and to be ready to prevent any serious damage." And following out this conclusion, she says to the child--"I fear you will hurt yourself if you do that." Suppose, now, that the child perseveres, as he will very probably do; and suppose that he ends by burning himself. What are the results? In the first place he has gained an experience which he must gain eventually, and which, for his own safety he cannot gain too soon. And in the second place, he has found that his mother's disapproval or warning was meant for his welfare; he has a further positive experience of her benevolence--a further reason for placing confidence in her judgment and her kindness--a further reason for loving her.

Of course, in those occasional hazards where there is a risk of broken limbs or other serious bodily injury, forcible prevention is called for. But leaving out these extreme cases, the system pursued should be not that of guarding a child against the small dangers into which it daily runs, but that of advising and warning it against them. And by consistently pursuing this course, a much stronger filial affection will be generated than commonly exists. If here, as elsewhere,

the discipline of the natural reactions is allowed to come into play--if in all those out-of-door scramblings and in-door experiments, by which children are liable to hurt themselves, they are allowed to persevere, subject only to discussion more or less earnest according to the risk, there cannot fail to arise an ever-increasing faith in the parental friendship and guidance. Not only, as before shown, does the adoption of this principle enable fathers and mothers to avoid the chief part of that odium which attaches to the infliction of positive punishment; but, as we here see, it enables them further to avoid the odium that attaches to constant thwartings; and even to turn each of those incidents which commonly cause squabbles, into a means of strengthening the mutual good feeling. Instead of being told in words, which deeds seem to contradict, that their parents are their best friends, children will learn this truth by a consistent daily experience; and so learning it, will acquire a degree of trust and attachment which nothing else can give.

Bear constantly in mind the truth that the aim of your discipline should be to produce a self-governing being; not to produce a being to be governed by others. Were your children fated to pass their lives as slaves, you could not too much accustom them to slavery during their childhood; but as they are by and by to be free men, with no one to control their daily conduct, you cannot too much accustom them to self-control while they are still under your eye. Aim, therefore, to diminish the amount of parental government as fast as you can substitute for it in your child's mind that self-government arising from a foresight of results. In infancy a considerable amount of absolutism is necessary. A three-year-old urchin playing with an open razor, cannot be allowed to learn by this discipline of consequences; for the consequences may, in such case, be too serious. But as intelligence increases, the number of instances calling for peremptory interference may be, and should be diminished; with the view of gradually ending them as maturity is approached. All periods of transition are dangerous; and the most dangerous is the transition from the restraint of the family circle to the non-restraint of the world. Hence the importance of pursuing the policy we advocate; which, alike by cultivating a child's faculty of self-restraint, by continually increasing the degree in which it is left to its self-constraint, and by so bringing it, step by step, to a state of unaided self-constraint, obliterates the ordinary sudden and hazardous change from externally-governed youth to internally-governed maturity.

Lastly, always remember that to educate rightly is not a simple and easy thing, but a complex and extremely difficult thing; the hardest task which devolves upon adult life. If you would carry out with success a rational and civilized system, you must be prepared for considerable mental exertion--for some study, some ingenuity, some patience, some self-control. You will have habitually to trace the consequences of conduct--to consider what are the results which in adult life follow certain kind of acts; and then you will have to devise methods by which parallel results shall be entailed on the parallel acts of your children.

SUBSCRIBE!!!

NAME

STREET OR BOX

CITY & STATE

Mail to

**Left and Right, Inc.
Box 395, Cathedral Station
New York, N. Y. 10025**

\$2.50 for one year

